

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

NO. 4.—OCTOBER, 1900.

I.

THE BOOK OF GOD.

BY PROFESSOR E. V. GERHART, D.D.

It is not my purpose to try to answer the question, What is the Bible? or, What does the Bible teach? but rather to state and justify some general principles of rational thought that, in the endeavor to make answer to such questions, underlie and must control legitimate investigation.

The personality of Jesus Christ is the unity of two factors, the divine and the human. As he is the presupposition and the regulative idea of Messianic revelation, these two factors enter dynamically as one plastic force into the meaning and structure of both Testaments, the Old and the New. They condition the origin, history and relations of every canonical book.

If we recognize the unique personality of Christ and accord both reality and significance to each factor in the development of Messianic revelation, it will follow that the Bible is under one aspect the Book of God and under another aspect the Book of Man; and that in consequence we have to anticipate two very different classes of phenomena. In the present article I shall confine myself chiefly to a discussion of some principles that must govern legitimate investigation into the claims of the Bible viewed as the Book of God.

There are different preliminary questions which, though important in their place, my aim does not require me to discuss. I merely name several. One question pertains to inspiration. Are the canonical books of the Old and the New Testaments divinely inspired? And if so, in what does inspiration consist? A question this is that calls for an answer; but in its bearing on the present discussion an answer is not essential. The Bible, taken as it is in its relation to the needs of the church, has intrinsic force as the Book of God, or as a sacred book, whatever may be our view of inspiration.

Another question concerns the authenticity of the several books. Was the entire pentateuch written by Moses? Were the Psalms, which by tradition are ascribed to David, actually indited by David? Do all the prophecies of the book of Isaiah proceed from the same writer? Was the Apostle Paul the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews? Are there some superficial errors in the Old or the New Testament—errors grammatical, or historical, or logical? Do irreconcilable discrepancies occur—as between the synoptists and the fourth Gospel concerning the events connected with the resurrection of our Lord? These and similar questions involve matters of solemn interest, and demand the recognition of biblical scholars; but they deal with the circumstantialia of Holy Scripture, not with its distinctive and essential qualities; and whatever may be the legitimate solution of such problems, the answer to be given to the main question is not thereby affected.

What kind of a Book is the Bible? is a question that must be answered in the light which the Bible sheds on itself. What does the Bible claim to represent? This inquiry must be resolved into two inquiries. What does the Old Testament claim? What does the New Testament claim?

To answer these inquiries legitimately there is but one way open and that way is to study the Bible. The Bible is the only source of knowledge concerning the contents of the Bible. What the old Testament is, what facts it represents, what problems it suggests, what revelations concerning God and man, espe-

cially concerning the advent of a Deliverer it records we may learn from the Old Testament, not primarily from books written on the Old Testament, however valuable, or even necessary, in other respects such books may be. What the New Testament is, what the facts are which it records, what the new revelation of God and man is which it declares, what the truths are concerning life and salvation which the New Testament teaches;—these and all cognate spiritual mysteries we may learn only from the New Testament, not primarily from introductions, or literary histories, or commentaries. The New Testament conditions them; they do not condition it. Between the two great divisions of the Bible there is a very wide difference and a very close connection; yet because of the difference we may not hold these two volumes asunder nor can we get a just comprehensive view of either independently of the other; nor yet because of the connection can we learn the purport of either from the contents of the other.

A faithful study of the pre-Christian Scriptures discloses a revelation that is self-assured, claiming for its representation of God, of His law, of His promises and His penalties, unconditional authority; yet the Old Testament is not satisfied with its own status; it anticipates and predicts a different and a better revelation of God that is to come in the fulness of time. Answering to these anticipations and predictions, the Christian Scriptures disclose a new order of facts that justifies itself at every turn by references to the events and the teaching of the pre-Christian Scriptures; nevertheless this new order asserts an authority that supersedes the authority of the antecedent revelation, and abolishes the very ordinances which the new order presupposes. Two opposite religions confront faith; but the New needs the Old, and the Old needs the New.

In other words, neither volume is an independent production. While each proclaims a self-manifestation of God peculiar to itself, yet the central idea of each involves an internal and vital connection with the central idea of the other. Of the Old Testament the true and full import becomes evident in the facts of

the New. Of the New Testament the possibility and necessity are, in the extraordinary Providence of God, given by the history of the chosen nation as recorded by a succession of many writers in the books of the Old Testament. The judgment of Augustine affirmed in the fifth century still deserves to be honored: *Novum Testamentum in vetere latet, vetus in novo patet.*

How shall we determine whether the internal relationship between the two volumes, as tersely formulated by Augustine, be true, or even approximately true? Just as we determine what either volume is when considered by itself, that is by a faithful and sympathetic study of both records. As from the books of the Old Testament, not from any other books ancient or modern, we may learn the fundamental principle and unique aim of the revelation which the Old Testament claims for itself; as from the books of the New Testament, not from Philo, not from any school of Greek philosophy, nor from the religious or theological traditions distinguishing the Jews in the times of our Lord, we may learn the characteristic facts of our Lord's personal history, His wonderful deeds of love and the new spiritual truths taught by Him; so from the anticipative attitude of the Old Testament toward a different revelation that was to come, and from the complementary attitude of the Gospels and Epistles toward "the law and the prophets," we may learn the organic relationship of the two volumes. Of this organic relationship we have an expression from the lips of our Lord as on the day of His resurrection He was walking with two of His saddened disciples toward "a village named Emmaus": He said unto them: "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into His glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures, the things concerning Himself."* The things concerning Himself the risen Christ interpreted, not from the Apocrypha, not from contemporaneous Jewish or Greek literature, but "from Moses," and "from all the prophets," and "from all the Scriptures"; assuming

* Luke 24: 25-27.

that the Messianic principle, the idea respecting Himself, as crucified and risen, to them hidden, was the import "of all the Scriptures."

The concrete relation existing between the Christian economy and the pre-Christian economy is a permanent historical relation. It is to-day what it was when the risen Christ opened the hidden meaning of the Old Testament to the two disciples. Of this concrete historical relation, the Old and the New Testaments, as different and essential records of one revelation, are the expressions in divine-human speech. Is it needful to say that the assumption of our Lord respecting the organic connection of the two economies is for the Christian theologian a valid assumption? or that His method of interpreting "all the Scriptures" (of the Old Testament) in their direct relation to His Person and mediatorial work is for the Christian exegete the only true method?

There is no alternative. To form a correct conception of the canonical writings, whether of the sixty-six books taken singly, or of either volume, or of all the parts taken as internally connected members of one Bible, we are shut up to the study of the canonical writings, one by one, as members of a whole. Whatever question may be put concerning the spiritual contents of the Bible we may answer, if answerable at all, only by faithfully studying these spiritual contents. Has the Bible a distinctive genius? Wherein does its genius differ from the import of the sacred books of India or Persia or Scandinavia? What is peculiar to the New Testament as distinguished from the Old? There is but one answer to be given. Learn what the Bible is from the Bible. Whether or not it has a distinctive genius we can determine only by a judicious and thorough inquiry into its contents. If it has a distinctive genius, how shall we ascertain what that distinctive genius is? whether pure or not pure, ennobling or not ennobling, whether unique, or closely allied to pagan literature? The answer to either question we can get only from the Book itself. We may go a step further. If it be assumed that the Bible fails to sustain the judgment of the

Church Catholic concerning its unique spiritual contents, the assumption of such failure can be logically justified by one method only, by reflection on its contents in the light of its claims; as regards the New Testament, by reflection on its contents in the light of the Christianity which it represents, not by an appeal to the natural understanding. The Bible furnishes its own critical standard of judgment. God only can reveal God to a god-like personal being. So a book, if it be the Book of God, must be able to manifest itself as such to a person of kindred spirit. If a book does not possess that intrinsic force it is not the Book of God; and that negative issue will become evident from impartial inquiry into the Book itself, not by argument from any premise other than itself.

The principle which I am emphasizing is a self-evident principle, and is universally asserted; asserted spontaneously, if not consciously, in all departments of literature, in philosophy, in poetry, in natural science, in history, in jurisprudence, no less than in theology. For theology as a science claims no prerogatives that are not claimed by all sciences.

To form a just opinion of Homer's *Iliad*, the great epic of the Greeks, we read and study this epic. If we believe that there are errors current concerning the time of its origin, or its structure, or its merits, we test the validity of our belief by a more thorough inquiry into the character and history of the poem. The *Iliad* furnishes the criterion of judgment concerning itself; nothing else. If we choose to compare the *Iliad* with the great epic of England, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, we are governed by the same law. It goes without saying, that no judgment of *Paradise Lost* is of any value unless developed from a sympathetic knowledge of the poem. When the idea of each epic is derived from itself we may consider each relatively to the other, and form an intelligent judgment on points of difference between pagan and Christian presuppositions.

Especially is this law valid in relation to Shakespeare. What has given impulse to the notable increase of the Shakespearian literature of our century? The study of Shakespeare. How

comes it that the appreciation of the greatness of Shakespeare's genius has been growing through a succession of decades? How comes it that in the judgment of experts this prince of poets stands without a superior in the realm of poetic art? There is but one answer. Shakespeare has in our century been read and studied with a degree of inductive skill, of esthetic sympathy and philosophic insight that is exceptional. Shakespeare has been revealing himself to thoughtful students. It is he that has given to literature the ideal of his genius. And in the degree that scholars contemplate this ideal a Shakespearian judgment is formed and developed. As Shakespeare gives us the ideal, so contact with the productions of his genius cultivates the ability of appreciating the ideal. Can any poet take his place? Great as is the genius of Goethe, can we learn from Goethe what Shakespeare is, or, to reverse the antithesis, can we learn from Shakespeare what Goethe is? Can the judgment of any man, concerning either Goethe or Shakespeare, or any other poet, command respect, unless based on a thorough knowledge of the author himself, a knowledge gained, not at second hand, nor reasoned out on the basis of an abstract *a priori* thesis, but from immediate contact with the mind of the author as embodied in his literary works?

Similar illustrations of the principle which I am emphasizing may be seen in the sphere of philosophy. Of Plato we form a valid judgment only from the study of Plato; of Aristotle from the study of Aristotle. So of Kant or Hegel. It may be safely assumed that no one will dispute the validity of the principle which these illustrations involve. Indeed, the validity of the principle is so generally assumed in all departments of literature that it may seem entirely superfluous to pursue any argument in support of it. Yet it is apropos to say that all argument in support of it is not superfluous; for the principle as applicable to the Book of God is not universally conceded by its foes, not universally adopted and applied by its friends.

Whilst scholars as a rule proceed logically in the study of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason there are many scholarly men

who approach the study of the Bible illogically. There is an affinity between the Kantian and the Aristotelian method of philosophic thought; but no judicious student begins the study of Kant on the fixed assumption that Kant is no more than a reproduction of Aristotle. He takes up Kant with a receptive and candid mind, resolved to ascertain the controlling spirit of Kantian metaphysics from Kant himself; and only in so far as he is governed by this law of inquiry has his judgment any value either for himself or in the sphere of philosophy. Such is not the method of many scholars who handle fundamental questions relating to the Bible. They approach this wonderful Book on the basis of an *a priori* thesis, namely, that it is the record of a purely natural development of the moral and religious life of the Hebrew nation, a development the same in kind as that of the religions of Babylonia, Egypt and Greece, of China and India, with the important difference that the religions of Christ and of the Hebrews are of all ethnic religions the most noble and desirable. Governed by this thesis as the principle of inquiry and thought the student sees in the Old and New Testament only human facts, no divine facts; sees only natural phenomena, no supernatural phenomena; sees only myths, fables and superstitions in the narration of extraordinary events, not the transcendent manifestations to faith of God's love and God's righteous judgments in the history of our race. Governed persistently by such a principle, the student if he reasons according to the laws of thought cannot readily reach any other conclusion; nor do I on this score find any fault with him. Nevertheless in the light of sound reason this entire process of professed inquiry must be pronounced irrational and unscientific—irrational, because the process of inquiry starts with an arbitrary hypothesis; unscientific, because the hypothesis is in conflict with the fundamental laws of literary judgment as dominant in all departments of literature—in all but the canonical books of the Bible.

In one respect "higher criticism" has been studying Holy Scripture under the guidance of a valid principle of inquiry. Book by book, part by part, word by word has been scrutinized in order

to determine literary and historical questions. And many of the results of such scrutiny and comparison are valuable contributions to biblical literature, rectifying not a few traditional views respecting authorship of particular books and cognate problems. But whenever "higher criticism" approaches the Bible on the assumption that it is a human book, and human only, a book produced by the religious genius of men, like the Vedas of India or the Eddas of Scandinavia, thus ignoring (if not denying) the claims of the Bible that it is the Word of God no less than the word of man;—then such "criticism" pursues its inquiries on the basis of a false literary principle, a principle that joins issue with the genius of the volume into which criticism professes to be making faithful inquiry, thus destroying the validity of its theoretic inferences respecting the dignity and authority of this unique Book.

Two things may be said in vindication of an illogical approach to the critical study of the Bible: the one, that neither the Old Testament nor the New Testament is now extant in the form in which the contents were pronounced by the original seers, or indited by the original writers; the other, that these volumes profess to be not ordinary human books, not produced by the genius of man, like Plato or Shakespeare, but to have a superhuman origin and to be the expression of the divine word.

With the first proposition there is no issue to be taken on the score of truth. Scholarship has shown that the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament as they now stand in the Bible are not there in their original form, but are the result of compilations made at different times and by different hands. Even to an intelligent reader who does not know Hebrew, the fact of such an historical process becomes evident, if he thoughtfully examines the English text. When we approach the New Testament with a similar inquiry we are constrained to form a similar judgment. It is evident from a comparison of the Gospels with one another that the order of the statement of some facts as given by the Evangelists differs from the real order of their occurrence; and that the real order of some of our Lord's teachings differed from the order of

the records. Note but one illustration. The Sermon on the Mount is recorded by Matthew and Luke; by Matthew in the form of a complete whole, spoken by Christ on one occasion; by Luke in detached portions, spoken by Him on different occasions. Whilst Matthew and Luke are harmonious and complementary they reveal the conscientious freedom of editorship.

From these facts, however, no inference can be drawn to the prejudice of the principle for which I am contending, that a legitimate judgment of the contents of the Bible is to be derived from a sympathetic study of the Bible. The question is not: By what process was the Old or New Testament, as we now have it, produced? or, How, in the progress of the ages, did either volume come to get its present structure? The answer to be given to such inquiries in its relation to the main question is a matter of indifference. The Bible is what it is, as to-day it addresses us. What kind of a book is the New Testament? What does it teach? That is the chief question; and the answer can be given only by the New Testament. Whether the first Gospel was written originally in Hebrew, and afterwards translated into Greek by Matthew or some other hand; whether the second Gospel embodies the oldest traditions of our Lord's personal history; whether the Acts proceed from one writer, or from two or more are questions both interesting and important. But if such questions were all satisfactorily answered, the law of rational inquiry would nevertheless continue in full force. We are shut up to the impartial study of Matthew in order to determine what the Gospel of Matthew is. By no other method can we form a judgment of the first Gospel.

As regards the other proposition, that the Bible professes to have a superhuman origin and therefore the law of inquiry universally observed in its relation to all departments of literature may not be enforced in forming a critical judgment of the Bible, logical thought draws directly the opposite inference. If the Bible, as it claims, be the authoritative word of God; if it contains a theocratic history of an elect nation; if it records the personal history of a Man whom no foe could convict of sin, who

saved all that came to Him from all evils, who, though put to death and buried, rose from the dead, and in presence of His disciples ascended to the throne of God;—if the Bible be a book making such extraordinary claims, claims that find no parallel in any other volume the world over, claims that to the natural understanding are foolishness,* then certainly one of two things must follow: either this pretentious Book deserves no more consideration than Robinson Crusoe, or it absolutely furnishes its own criterion of judgment, demanding inquiry exclusively from its own point of view. Men cannot kill the Bible by the sword of philosophy or natural science. Such weapons are wielded on the outside; and to such weapons the Bible is invulnerable. The only way to kill the Bible is to pierce its vitals, and expose the fashood and folly which, as some imagine, is lurking within.

Granting the principle that from the Bible we have to learn what the Bible is, I pass on to the question whether all scholars are qualified to apply the principle? Is scholarship the chief qualification whether in the sphere of history or philosophy or philology, or in the sacred literature of ethnic religions, or in Assyriology or Egyptology? Is the ability to read the canonical writings in the original Hebrew and Greek with as much facility as a scholar may read Tennyson in his mother tongue the chief qualification?

The necessity and value of scholarship in the solution of all problems involving the canonicity, the correct text, the interpretation, authority and scope of any book of the Bible no rational judgment will dispute; but from the acknowledged essentiality of scholarship it does not follow that there is not a requisite qualification more fundamental, more decidedly regulative of trustworthy results. History and experience teach that in no department of literature is scholarship (using the word in the usual sense as denoting accurate learning combined with a high order of mental discipline) the chief qualification for the discovery and maintenance of truth. Scholarship to be effective and trustworthy presupposes insight and sympathy: insight into the

peculiar genius or type of apprehension and thought of the book under review; sympathy with the realm of truth from which the book derives its inspiration. Insight and sympathy impart moral tone and purpose to scholarship. In jurisprudence a judicial mind and an intuitive perception of law in its relation to a given fact condition the authority of a legal judgment. Scholarship can make no contribution of real value to Shakespearean literature unless guided by the light of a Shakespearean judgment. And a Shakespearean judgment presupposes two things: an inborn capacity or talent for fine art, especially for the life of poetry; and the cultivation of this talent by intimate fellowship with Shakespeare himself as he lives and breathes in his tragedies. Jurisprudence is subject to the same conditions. A judicial mind is an inborn capacity; but it calls for legal culture; and legal culture is an intellectual growth that can be developed only by legal studies, by close fellowship with men possessing legal culture. Scholarship issues in progress by virtue of the power, intellectual and moral, that intones scholarship.

To no book does this law of rational life apply with more propriety and force than to the Bible. Here, as in literature universally, insight and sympathy condition the worth and efficiency of scholarship in the acquisition of truth. But as the Bible is a unique book, claiming to represent a unique revelation of God and man, a revelation of truth absolute and eternal, in historical order, the necessity of insight and sympathy is unconditionally imperative. Otherwise the judgment of scholarship has no value. The value of a Shakespearean judgment depends primarily on esthetic insight and poetic sympathy. The beautiful and sublime also are factors that enter into the structure of the Bible as really as into Shakespeare; but of the Bible beauty and sublimity of form are only the rich drapery worn by its embodied idea. That idea is the Messianic principle. The Old Testament presents it in figures of speech, in types and shadows, in symbols and prophecies. The New Testament presents it in the character of fulfilment in the Person and personal history of Jesus Christ.*

* Heb. 1:1-4. Heid. Cm. 2, 19.

In other words, the Bible claims to be a spiritual book, recording the manifestation, in a unique personal history, of two worlds, the supernatural and the natural, the heavenly and the earthly; rather the history of the supernatural in the natural, of the Divine in the human. A spiritual book demands a spiritual judgment; and a spiritual judgment presupposes spiritual insight, no less than literary acumen. Spiritual insight is the fundamental possibility of a genuine spiritual judgment. An esthetic judgment can be cultivated, not by mathematics, but by communion with the beautiful as it addresses us, beaming from the bright face of nature, or as it greets us from noble works of art. A philosophic judgment can be cultivated, not by familiarity with military tactics, but by those studies and that peculiar intellectual discipline into which the student is initiated by philosophy; so a spiritual judgment can be cultivated, can acquire the power of nice discrimination between the truly rational and the irrational, not by classical learning or natural science, but by entering with an open, receptive mind into that higher, that divine realm which the Bible professes to reflect. As only from the Bible we may learn what kind of book the Bible is, so under the tuition of the Bible alone by a process of training can any man, whatever the extent or whatever the intrinsic value of his scholarship, develop a spiritual judgment answerable to the claims of the Bible.

The two-fold law (1) that a scholar must study the spiritual contents of the Bible in its own light, and (2) that he can develop an adequate spiritual judgment under the tuition of the Bible alone, deserves some further consideration. Several inferences are involved in this discussion which may be briefly stated.

If the Bible furnishes the only valid criterion of judgment respecting its worth, then faith and scholarship are justified when the Bible is judged by that criterion to the exclusion of all others. From the beginning to the end the Bible claims to be a book of the absolute *religion*, not of Buddhism nor of any other ethnic religion, not a book of philosophy, not of natural science, nor of secular history, not even a book of ethics. The claims of the

Bible are more profound and more comprehensive. It does not antagonize any realm of normal human life; nor may we say that it is disrespectful to any system of philosophy, nor to any sphere of art, nor to any honorable vocation of civilized society. But it claims to teach and to realize the truth that is fundamental to the whole of human life, to its laws and its end, truth that conditions the validity and the wisdom of all branches of knowledge and of all legitimate lines of activity. That Truth is not taught by Genesis in contradistinction from the prophecies of Isaiah, nor taught by the Old Testament in contradistinction from the New Testament, nor in the Gospels as distinguished from the Epistles; but taught historically by the Bible as a whole, taught by every canonical book in its historical connection with all other books. The order of teaching is organic and is symbolized by the growth of a seed. Says our Lord: * "So is the kingdom of God as if a man should cast seed upon the earth; and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up and grow, he knoweth not how. The earth beareth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. But when the fruit is ripe, straightway he putteth forth the sickle, because the harvest is come." The representation of the beginning, the growth and the fruitage of the kingdom, as pictured by this beautiful parable, sketches an image of the development of the Messianic idea. The life in the idea begins like a plant in the seed, like a man in the embryo, and develops year by year, age by age, ever passing from a lower to a higher form, passing through epochs and cycles of self-assertion and progress, toward full realization in the Messianic harvest. The concrete history of the Messianic idea is its progressive realization; and the progressive realization is its progressive revelation; and the progressive revelation is exhibited, more or less completely, by the structure of the Bible. Being the reflection of Messianic history, the method of the Bible representation answers to the progressive realization of the Messianic idea somewhat as the literary form of our Lord's parable answers to the actual growth of the seed.

* Mk. 4: 26-29.

Of the plant the criterion of judgment is not the "blade" alone nor the "ear," nor yet "the full corn in the ear"; nor is it the parts of the process taken collectively. The criterion is the plant viewed as a whole, including the seed and the parts, no less also the order of growth and the reciprocal relations of the "blade" and the "ear." Given the type of the plant as developed and realized by the growth and status of its own order of life, embracing all its relations, and we may have an adequate criterion of judgment. In like manner we may obtain from the Bible a criterion of judgment respecting the Messianic idea as reflected by the Bible. The first chapters of Genesis do not furnish the criterion of judgment respecting biblical teaching on the mystery of creation, or the constitution of man. The first chapter of the fourth Gospel and the first chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians have somewhat also to say on this problem which is no less necessary. If a scientist criticises the Christian conception of creation on the basis of Genesis alone the criticism is unscientific as well as unphilosophical and unbiblical. The wars of Joshua waged against the Canaanites are not the criterion of Christian judgment respecting the character and dealings of God. The 23d and the 103d Psalms, and the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah, not to name other books of the Old Testament, have something essential to teach concerning God's character, to say the least, of no less significance.

To reverse the regimen of thought. The truth of John 3:16: "God so loved the world," as exhibited by the awful mysteries of the cross; or the parable of the good Shepherd seeking the lost sheep; or the extraordinary invitation: "Come unto me all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest"; or Jesus on Mount Olivet weeping over the prospective destruction of Jerusalem;—neither of these significant expressions of divine love, nor all combined with many others of the same tone, afford us the whole conception taught by the Bible. Such teachings as we have in the parables of the sheep and the goats, or in the terrific denunciations of Jesus pronounced upon the Scribes and Pharisees* are essential parts of the biblical idea of the nature of

* Matt. 23.

God's righteous love ; and if it is ignored we get a defective and misleading standard of judgment.

I use but one illustration more, taken from the four Gospels. It is the whole New Testament, embracing every canonical book, that furnishes the criterion of judgment respecting the life and nature of Jesus Christ, His relation to God the Father, His relation to man, and His mediatorship. The synoptists, considered separately or in conjunction, do not furnish the adequate criterion of judgment. If the fourth gospel be ignored the criterion is incomplete. Neither does the sermon on the mount as reported by Matthew constitute the law, as some maintain, by which the doctrines taught by Christ are to be judged. Then it would follow that, as the fundamental necessity of faith and a vicarious atonement for the guilt of sin are not taught in this extraordinary discourse, neither the necessity of faith nor an atonement are essential elements of Christianity. Our Lord's doctrine of the kingdom figured by the parable quoted above, condemns the attempt to exhibit the import of the written Word relating to the person or doctrine of Christ by any one-sided or mutilated representation. Like Christianity the Bible is a unit, not a mechanical but an organic unity, all of whose parts are to be interpreted in their relation to the central Truth, Jesus Christ.

The parable * of the gradual growth of seed "cast upon the earth" into ripe fruitage, likewise by implication supports the law touching the culture of a spiritual judgment. The botanist, on the one hand, studies the individual plant and the plant kingdom in order to ascertain the nature of plant life, and on the other hand he pursues these studies in order to cultivate a botanical judgment. The longer he pursues these studies and the more varied they are the more correct and keen his judgment becomes. He increases his knowledge and educates his judgment by diligent experiment, and by persistent inquiry into the nature, laws and conditions of the vegetable kingdom—of particular species and of the kingdom as a whole. Can he do this by inquiry into animal life? For the culture of a broad and trustworthy botan-

* Mk. 4 : 26.

ical judgment he is limited to the vegetable kingdom. The plant reveals the plant; and only under the tuition of the plant does a person acquire fitness to judge of the plant.

This principle also is universal; and it is universally honored by naturalists. No scientist violates it. The ability to form a judgment on any question of natural science can be developed only under the tuition of natural science. The close contact of nature with mind disciplines mind in its relation to nature. The man who lacks this special discipline is ruled out of court. For the naturalist his testimony has no regulative force. Nor is any fault to be found with the proceeding.

Now as every scientist honors this principle whatever may be the kingdom of nature with which he is especially conversant, so does every inquirer into the spiritual contents of the Bible who prosecutes his inquiries rationally. It is irrational to pursue the study of the great epochs of universal history guided solely by a mathematical judgment, or to endeavor justly to estimate the truth of Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* guided solely by an historical judgment. No less irrational is it to endeavor to cultivate a historical judgment, a nice perception of the complex forces that enter into the civil movements of history, under the tuition solely of mathematics. No less irrational is it to estimate the contents of a spiritual book guided solely by a secular judgment, or to aim at acquiring a biblical judgment, a judgment answering to the laws, powers and movements of that spiritual world which the Bible proclaims, by the study solely of the laws and powers of the natural world. As nature realizes and reveals the laws of nature, so does the history of the kingdom of God realize and reveal the constitution and laws of this spiritual kingdom. As only under the tuition of nature a man may acquire a scientific judgment of nature, so only under the spiritual tuition of the kingdom of God, as represented by the written word, can a man acquire a spiritual judgment. The Bible illumines itself, and illumines nature; but it does not supersede the light of nature. Nature reveals its laws, not to itself, but to human insight. Objectively nature is related to its Author and to a spiritual tele-

ology; but nature does not interpret these profound relations. Neither Cicero nor Plato, penetrating as was their intuitive perception, rich and uplifting as were some of their religious conceptions, interpreted nature as to its origin or its ultimate consummation. As the Bible illumines nature, a spiritual judgment, guided by the light of the Bible and by the facts of the natural world, may develop a sound philosophy of the universe; and a sound philosophy, reacting on Christian scholarship, exerts a sustaining influence on the process of inquiry pursued by the spiritual reason. Yet the power of spiritual tuition is not shifted from the Bible to philosophy. That power is predicable only of the spiritual world; and only in the degree that a scholar is open and receptive to the transforming power of the spiritual world will his spiritual judgment be vitalized, and grow in strength and discriminating penetration.

The argument I have pursued, based on the recognized principle of legitimate investigation into a literary production, in its bearing on the spiritual contents of the Bible, is fully sustained by the explicit teaching, both of the Old and the New Testament. Says the Psalmist: "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and light unto my path." "The opening of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple." * Both passages speak of God's word under the image of light. His word illumines intellect and thought no less than the will and conduct. The same truth is taught in Proverbs: "The commandment is a lamp; and the law is light." † Passing to the New Testament we meet with teaching still more forcible. In reply to the question of His disciples as to the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, Jesus "called to him a little child, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in nowise enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven," ‡ greatest in point of dignity, greatest also in point of ethical

* Ps. 119: 105, 130.

† Prov. 6: 23.

‡ Math. 18: 3, 4.

and intellectual capacity. The same spiritual necessity requiring men to submit their judgment to the truth realized in Christ is taught by Mark and Luke in the parallel passages.* Our Lord charges the Jews that they have not the "word" of the Father "abiding in" them. Therefore they do not believe in Him whom the Father hath sent. The "word" of the Father abiding in them, and belief in Jesus are correlative. Belief in Him whom the Father hath sent conditions and evidences the indwelling "word" of the Father.

In the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel of John, the same general truth is taught in its direct connection with the advent of the Holy Spirit. Says our Lord: "The Father shall give you another Comforter, that He may be with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth: whom the world (*ὁ κόσμος*, the fallen human race) cannot receive; for it beholdeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: ye know Him; for He abideth with you and shall be in you."† The disciples of Christ know the Spirit of truth, for the Spirit abideth with them, and is in them. But the "world" does not receive the Spirit of truth, and as *world* cannot receive the Spirit. As a consequence the world does not know the Spirit. Not possessing, and not knowing the Spirit, the "world" does not know the truth of the spiritual world, and thus is disqualified for the exercise of a spiritual judgment on the fundamental claims of the Bible.

The Apostle Paul is explicit and uncompromising in asserting the necessity of a spiritual mind in things of the Spirit. Drawing a broad line of contrast between the natural man and the spiritual man, he teaches that to the natural man the things of the Spirit are foolishness; he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged; but he that is spiritual judgeth all things; he by the Spirit of God is qualified (not magically nor without spiritual training) to examine and pronounce upon the things of the Spirit; and no man of the world has a logical right to challenge the judgment of him that

* Mk. 9: 36 and 10: 15. Lk. 9: 46 and 18: 17. Comp. Pa. 131: 2.

† Jno. 14: 16.

is spiritual. He that is spiritual not only judges all spiritual things, but "he himself is judged of no man."* As a matter of course the judgment of the spiritual man on the things of the Spirit will differ, must differ, and differ widely, from the judgment of the natural man. If his judgment did not differ it would not be worthy of respect. The mathematician has no logical right as a mathematician to challenge the judgment of an expert in the science of botany on a problem touching the constitution or history of the vegetable kingdom. The mind of a botanist on such a problem cannot but differ from the mind of a man who is governed only by the formulas of mathematics; if not, would it be respected?

In closing the argument it is in place to reassert the general proposition, that on the one hand the Bible requires and demands no principle of reasoning in its support that any other branch of literature does not demand, and on the other hand that the Bible can tolerate the violation of no principle of rational inquiry that any other branch of literature refuses to tolerate. The principles of rational criticism are the same for all departments of literature, religious or secular, whatever a book may profess to be. By these principles, Shakespeare stands, or falls. By these principles, legitimately asserted, consistently applied, the Book of God will stand, or will fall. By no other does the Book propose to stand; by no other can it fall.

As I survey the public mind of our day in its relation to the religion of Christ and to Holy Scripture, especially the attitude of scientific and philosophic thought, it seems to me that the unique Book is not only calling for scholarly exposition of its teaching, but especially for the assertion and vindication in the sphere of scholarship of a sound and self-consistent logic.

* I Cor. 2:14-16.

II.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

BY THE REV. A. S. WEBER, A.M.

Lord show us the Father and it sufficeth us.—*Philip*.
To us there is one God, the Father.—*Paul*.

The fundamental assumption and assertion of the Old and New Testament Scriptures is the existence of a personal God. In the course of the religious history recorded in those sacred writings, there came to be known more and more fully, the character of God and the relation He sustains to men. From very crude and imperfect notions of the Divine character in its human relations, the careful study of this historic process shows, men were gradually led to conceptions of God immeasurably more worthy of Him and at the same time more satisfying to the mind and heart of His worshipers.

Much might be learned of the successive steps in the progressive revelation of God, or of the natural development or evolution of the idea of God—if the terminology of modern, critical and scientific thought be preferable—much might be learned from a comparison of the earlier and later names by which Deity is designated. Without pausing, however, even to recall those names, it will answer present purposes to affirm that the long-continued process of revelation or evolution, culminated in the manifestation of the Divine Being as made in the teachings and personal life of Jesus Christ. Those teachings constantly supported and confirmed by His personal life; or rather, that self-conscious life issuing in His teachings, has for its very heart and center the Fatherhood of God. Coming forth from God in possession, as He claimed, of a unique knowledge of Him, and with power, solely His, to communicate that knowledge unto the world, His representation of God in His paternal character, is assuredly de-

serving of ever being studied anew, and will ever yield, no doubt, new lessons of practical religious value, of spiritual uplift and power.

Before attempting an estimate of the content of the Father-name as employed by Jesus, or a survey of the scope of His conception of the Divine Fatherhood, it may be well to remind ourselves how constantly the new Name is made to re-appear, and how, as by an everywhere present atmosphere, His view of the paternal relationship of God to man, pervades not only the four Gospels, but the several epistles likewise, of the New Testament. It would be an idle and unprofitable speculation to inquire how Jesus developed into His original and unique consciousness of God as Father. Unquestionably it was His from a deep personal experience; it was not something foreign and unimportant to Him, but rather that which was most deeply essential to His life. It determined for Him everything else. This may be gathered from a partial and hasty glance over the history of His earthly life, the events and incidents of which invariably bear testimony to the facts referred to.

In the first utterance recorded as having been spoken by Jesus His consciousness of the Fatherhood of God comes to expression, "I must be about my Father's business." The last words that fall from His lips trembling in death disclose the same truth, "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit." All the while from the commencement of His earthly career on to its end, when thinking of, or speaking to God, "Father" is the name that springs unbidden from His tongue. So far as His prayers are concerned there is but a single exception to this, and in that instance, it will be remembered, He quotes from the twenty-second Psalm. So it is also when He teaches others about God: The woman of Sychar to whom He first announced Himself to be the Messiah is told three times that God is the Father. The disciples whom He taught how to pray are told to address God as Father. When the eldest of the apostles has made the great confession, the assurance is given him that flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto him, but the Father which is in heaven.

When a lesson of simple trust in God is to be enforced His hearers are reminded that their heavenly Father feedeth the fowls of the air. When comfort was needed by sorrowing hearts in an hour of gloom, He said "I came forth from the Father, and again I return unto the Father." Baptism the initial ordinance enjoined by Him is first to be into the name of the Father. The aim of personal spiritual effort is to be to become like the Father. Our Advocate in heaven is forever to be with the Father. The Comforter, who is to abide with us "alway even unto the end of the world," is to come from the Father. Our eternity is to be spent in the many-mansioned house of the Father. And so on in scores of instances, the references made to God, name Him Father.

This practically exclusive use of the Father-name by Him who had so much to say of the Kingdom of God is very remarkable. The kingdom to come is to be the Father's Kingdom, and the significance of this did not escape those whom He was training to carry forward His work. From their prayers, their sermons, their letters afterwards, we discover that they have caught their Master's conception of God and that they are putting it to practical use. Throughout the twenty-seven books of the New Testament God is spoken of as King only in five instances; several times He is called spirit, light, love; and once He is said to be a consuming fire. In about two hundred and twenty passages He is named Father. When this endearing, winsome name, Father, is thus found displacing those by which before God had been generally known, is it an unwarranted suggestion, as made by someone, that "here we have the key which will open the door into all the knowledge which men can have of God?"* When the name Father is applied to God forty times while King is used once, and a hundred times while any other name is employed to designate Him, must we not infer that Christ intended by the revelation of the new name to give men the loftiest and worthiest knowledge now possible, of the God who claims the loving reverence of their hearts and the obedient service of their lives?

* Bradford's "The Growing Revelation," p. 26.

At this point it is proper to ask, however, whether this conception of God as Father is really original and unique in the Christian Scriptures. Is it correct to claim that Jesus by His teachings in this form really did give us a higher and truer knowledge of the living God? Does not nature itself teach men to think of the Maker and Sustainer of the world as the Father who created them and who supplies them with their daily bread? Did not some of the Indians with this thought in mind worship their Deity as the heaven-Father? Is not Zeus the Father of gods and men in the Homeric poems? Is not the name Father recognized as applicable to God in the Old Testament? Was He not the Father of Israel if not of the whole race? Was He not the Father of the chosen nation as a corporate unity, if not of individual Hebrews? May not Max Müller be entirely right in declaring that "there is no religion which is sufficiently recorded to be understood, that does not in some sense or other apply the term Father to its Deity?"

To all such questions there must be given of course an affirmative answer. But this surely does not invalidate the contention that in Jesus' use of the name, Father, there is that which is absolutely original and unique. Those who suppose the contrary from the verbal connection discoverable in the name applied to God by the Ethnic and Jewish religions on the one hand, and by Christ and the Christian religion on the other, have not looked beneath the surface of the revelation of Jesus. They forget that many words are peculiarly elastic things and capable of containing just as much meaning as the heart which uses them can pour into them. The word Father is one of these, and on Jesus' lips it must not be supposed to mean, just what it had always meant before. Stevens, in the opening sentence of his beautiful chapter on the Fatherhood of God, is doubtless right in saying that "the teaching of Jesus concerning God rests upon an Old Testament basis."* He might have said perhaps with equal truthfulness that the roots of His teaching on this point reach back into the intuitions of God as expressed in nature religions. But

* *The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 65.

whilst granting this, it must be seen at once that Jesus carried the meaning of the word Father far beyond anything that either prophet or seer had ever dreamed of or imagined.

In its earlier usage the name Father was, broadly speaking, the equivalent simply of Creator, and referred in a general way to the relation which in virtue of His creative act God sustained to human kind. With the possible exception of a few passages in the Old Testament where under the flash of special Divine illumination a momentary glimpse of God's moral character was caught by individuals, the name Father never indicates the existence of an ethical relation on God's part toward men. Much less is there discoverable anywhere that spiritual affinity uniting God and man by a tie of kinship and love of which Jesus assured men when he spoke to them of their Father in heaven. From His conception of the Fatherhood of God, men came to know God in His actual, ever-present, loving, personal relationship as Father to individual men. Only as we come to appreciate this can we properly understand what He meant when saying according to an ancient reading of Matt. 11: 27 that "no man *knew* the Father save the Son";* or as the ordinary version has it that "no one knoweth the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him." In His holy and loving character as Father, mindful of and present with His children everywhere and always, no man at anytime had seen God," "the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." If, accordingly, we desire to know the Father in the sense in which Jesus declared Him, we cannot be satisfied with the superficial knowledge of the name. It is the fullness of meaning which the Father-name has, that is to be earnestly and prayerfully sought after. And after every such effort one will discover meanings not yet grasped, meanings still to be striven for. Never can we exhaust the tenderness and love, the comfort and joy, the holiness and bliss with which Jesus has filled the new name. One whose keen spiritual penetration into the inner sanctuary of our Saviour's words, has made him the chosen

* See Bruce's *Kingdom of God*, p. 109.

guide of many of his contemporary students of the word in our day, says, "if there be any one who has never trembled at the glory and promise that are in the word Father, who has never hesitated even on his knees to use it as his word, is he not still using it merely as a form, not believing, perhaps never having even conceived, that there is a reality for which it stands?"*

The foregoing observations on Christ's meaning of the Father-name are somewhat too general to be allowed to satisfy our inquiry concerning it. If possible to attain it, more definite instruction as to the content and scope of the name is certainly desirable. And such instruction offers itself in the record to which our study is limited, not indeed in the form of definite propositions; not, according to the custom of Dogmatic Theologies, in a catalogue of so-called attributes of God; but in the assumptions and implications on which Christ's conception of God rests, in the parables and parabolical acts of His life by which the Divine character in its man-ward relation is set forth, and in the general "tone" and "trend" of the Gospel story. For the complete appreciation and apprehension of this, it need hardly be said there are more requirements than the intellect can furnish. In addition to certain endowments of mind, the life of a spiritual being is needed. Moral affections, moral perceptions, spiritual affinities and satisfactions are requisite.† In a word the heart, which we are often told makes the theologian, is demanded in order to fathom the benignity and love for which the name Father stands, and to estimate aright the gracious and blessed disposition it is intended to indicate in God's relation toward men. Let us guide our inquiries after more particular knowledge of the Fatherhood of God by mentioning definitely several of its important features.

First, Jesus intended the name Father to indicate a close, personal, intimacy on God's part toward men. He wished to rescue the idea of God from the realm of a cold, distant and powerless separation or abstraction, and to make it a practical living power

* Dod's, *The Prayer that Teaches to Pray*, p. 7.

† Compare *Lux Mundi*, pp. 229-230.

in the human heart. In his *Present Day Theology*, Stearns says that "on the uplands of much of the traditional theology of our times, the atmosphere is attenuated and cold, and in it one finds little to satisfy the intellect, or cheer and warm the heart."* The words are an apt description of much of the religious thought Jesus met with among His contemporaries. In abhorrence of heathen pantheism the Jews had exalted God above the creation so far as to make it practically impossible for any of them to see how He could come near enough to men, to afford them opportunity of communing with Him. Their well-meant effort had landed them in a cold and dreary theism in which an ever-widening gulp yawned between God and men. The simple affirmation of the Divine Fatherhood was the one powerful stroke, the most revolutionary Christ made, by which the imagined wall of separation was forever broken down. In delivering it He assumed the monotheism of His forefathers, He insisted, as we shall see presently, on the lofty moral character of God and His supreme righteousness, but at the same time He altered the proportions of truths in the Divine character, exalted and expanded previously neglected features of it, and essentials which had been left in the dim distance He brought forth prominently into the foreground. Instead of being a God infinitely removed and unapproachable, He is the Father intimately close to His children, His ear ever open to their cry. Instead of being a God ruling over men in an arbitrary way and unconcerned, like monarchs on earthly thrones, about the welfare of His subjects, He is the Father, the Head of a great family for which He is providing, over which He is watching with tenderest care, and whose members are invited and encouraged, in the utmost freedom to come and enjoy communion and fellowship with Him. This new view of God and of His relation to men came as a hallowed and hallowing benediction to the disciples of Christ. In the light of it they saw, just as we see, the new heaven, and the new earth, which Jesus revealed, a heaven brought near by Him from beyond the skies, an earth from which God is never absent, and which ever and everywhere is filled with the glory of His intimate personal presence.

* P. 152.

Second, Jesus meant the name Father to give abiding assurance to men of God's unchanging love. Among the Jews of His day, as, among people everywhere in ours, there were many whom nothing but this could save from despair. The rich who were clothed in fine linen and fared sumptuously every day, we can easily understand made little account of the new revelation. But were there not many "common people,"—common in their anxieties and misfortunes, their poverty and shame perhaps, who must have gladly heard the assurance from Christ of God's constant love? Seemingly chosen "to go through life pelted with troubles as with fiery hail," such persons needed and needed above everything else a true conception of God in His loving, fatherly relation toward them. This explains the patient insistence with which Jesus from the beginning to the end of His public ministry, pressed home to His hearer's hearts this truth of Divine love. "If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good gifts to them that ask Him." "Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things." "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son," for its redemption. The apostles at least had learned the inspiring power of this representation of the Father's heart. With what impressive tenderness John for instance insists that "God is love." With what passionate conviction Paul declares that the love of God which spared not his own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, must also prompt Him with Christ, freely to give us all things." The need among men of this knowledge of God's love will never be superseded. When the experiences of life, are mysterious and adverse; when the providences of God are beyond the power of human explanation; when prayer itself seems meaningless and vain; when the burden of imperfection, of shortcomings, and sin seems crushing; and when the terrors of death threaten to overwhelm and appall; what is there in all the universe so powerful to reassure, to cheer anew and support as the faithful acceptance of the revelation made by Christ of the abounding love of our Father in heaven? Browning must

have felt this when he wrote :

"I say the acknowledgement of God in Christ
Accepted by the reason, solves for thee,
All the questions in the earth and out of it."

Third, Jesus designed the name Father to tell of the universality of His paternal character. Strangely enough it has often happened that students of the New Testament in general or of the Fatherhood of God in particular, have not been able to agree with reference to the scope of this feature in Christ's portraiture of the Divine character. Without any hesitation some declare that the New Testament teaches that God is the Father of all men. Others equally earnest in their study of Scripture are just as ready to affirm that it teaches that God is the Father of Christians only. In support of the latter view it is argued that most of our Lord's words concerning the Fatherhood of God were addressed to His disciples, and that therefore, they have reference only to such as with them stand in and through Christ in a reconciled, saved, and filial relationship to God. It is said also that it was the disciples whom Jesus taught when praying to say "Our Father," and that therefore warrant is thereby given to disciples only to employ the endearing name. Furthermore it is contended that Jesus does speak distinctly of the necessity of complying with certain ethical conditions in the conduct of life in order that men may "be children of the Father which is in Heaven." And similarly once more, it is urged that Christ owns those who do the will of God as His own brethren and sisters, and that therefore God must be Father to them, and not to such as decline or refuse to do His will.

On the other hand, however, is it not true also that everything Jesus says of the nature and character of God suggests a breadth of Fatherhood which cannot be subjected to those limitations? Does not the whole idea of "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God," spring from that universality of Fatherhood which in its proclamation makes it "glad tidings of great joy" to sinners the world over? What but the fact that God in a very real sense is the Father of all men can give the intended force to such words

as "He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust?" Does not the parable of the Prodigal Son present the same idea most pointedly and forcibly, especially when it is remembered that it was spoken to rebuke the narrowness of the Pharisees who objected to Christ's fellowshiping with social outcasts and disreputable sinners? If His words do not lend themselves to the establishing of the universality of the Fatherhood, is it possible to put any other construction upon His deeds? Was not His personal bearing toward and intercourse with the despised and degraded sinners intended and declared to reveal the attitude of the Divine Being towards them and those like them? Far more emphatically and powerfully than most tender and pathetic words, did the loving deeds of Jesus prove His love for Publicans and sinners, prove to them that He regarded Himself their Brother, and prove that God still owned them, as Father.

Is there anything in the wide, wide world that can quicken desire to rise above one's lower self so effectively as the realization of God's Fatherhood? Is there any enthusiasm of goodness that can be excessive or unnatural to anyone that comes to know what it is to have in very truth the eternal God as Father, and to be in very fact His child? "If, as a native of Tarsus"—these words are James Martineau's—"the Apostle could not help saying with a glow of pride that he was 'a citizen of no mean city,' how is it possible, without a flush of higher joy, for anyone to know himself a denizen of the city and commonwealth of God—a community whose service is simple righteousness and whose patriotism an inextinguishable love of perfection."* Omit carrying with you as a Christian minister the message that on the Divine side the relationship of Fatherhood holds good for all men, what have you to take its place as a winning, converting power? Say in your preaching that God's Fatherhood is limited to those who are already trusting in His mercy and obeying His will, is not Dr. Dale right in declaring that then "you disturb, if you do not destroy, the very grounds of that faith in Him, in the

* Study of Religion, Vol. I., p. 27.

power of which men receive the forgiveness of sin and enter into the actual possession of the blessedness for which they were created in Christ." *

Between the two views now set forth, as to the scope of the Fatherhood of God, there is, when properly understood, no serious or irreconcilable difference. Adeney in his *Theology of the New Testament* writes, "the two positions may easily be brought into harmony. God is the Father of all mankind, loving all, and calls all to Himself in the Gospel. But his disobedient children do not enjoy the Fatherly relation; the prodigal son must come to himself before the fact that he has a Father can mean anything to him." † In thorough accord with this view, one is glad to find that of the genial and broad-minded scholar whose work as Professor of Christian Theology in Colgate University has brought him such well-deserved admiration and honor. In discussing the relation between God and men Dr. Clarke claims that "in fact both sides are right. The two positions fit together perfectly and ought to occasion no controversy." "I affirm," he adds, "that the relation to God of all created spirits is essentially, and from the terms of the case, a paternal relation, so called not by fiction, and scarcely even by metaphor, but in plain truth. From the very fact that God made them and made them like Himself, He is the Father to all men. But it does not follow that the Divine Fatherhood is realized in the lives of all His children. All men are God's offspring as Paul approvingly quoted from the Greek poet, God is the Father of all men, but not all men have to do with Him as their Father." ‡

Whilst in the preaching of the Gospel it is to be regarded a matter of profound importance to proclaim the Fatherhood of God as being of universal application, it would seem necessary to do it always with due qualifications. Two of these may be mentioned in conclusion. *One* is that Divine Fatherhood does not mean the abandoning on His part of the principles of holiness and righteousness, of equity and truth, in His dealings with men.

* *Life of R. W. Dale*, p. 605.

† P. 47.

‡ *Can I believe in God the Father*, pp. 138-139.

In our ordinary family relations we know fatherhood often degenerates into parental fondness, boundless amiability, slackness of discipline, and general over-indulgence. Of the Fatherhood of God this must never be supposed possible. He can never be oblivious to moral law, He can never be lax in the enforcement of righteous principle, He can never show over-sweetness in passing judgment upon human conduct. "God is indeed merciful but He is likewise just." To Jesus, He was ever the "Holy and Righteous Father." Forgetful of this, men may luxuriate in the love of God, without experiencing the cleansing effect that ought to result from it, without having the moral and spiritual aspirations quickened by its benign power. The fact is, it is the holiness of God's love that gives it its power, and so long as the Father's love, in its consumingly holy character as illustrated by the Cross of Christ, is not appreciated, so long it will not furnish the power needed for Christ-like living. In connection, therefore, with the remembrance of the universal love which the Fatherhood reveals to us, we shall do well to recall that of which Dr. Forsythe in his "Holy Father and the Living Christ" seeks to remind us, namely, that "love is not evangelical till it has dealt with holy law. In the midst of the rainbow is a throne. The Holy Father's first care is holiness. The first charge on a Redeemer is satisfaction to that holiness. There is a kind of consecration which would live close to the Father, but which does not always take seriously enough the holiness which makes the Fatherhood of the Cross awful, inexhaustible, and eternal, as full of judgment as of salvation." *

Is it not to be feared that a good deal of our present-day preaching of the Divine Fatherhood is seriously lacking at this point? As reflected in certain forms of modern literature this lack, one can't help thinking, is lamentably unfortunate. George MacDonald, for instance, who is said to consider it his special mission to lead a crusade against all creeds and formularies of the Christian faith, and to regard himself specially anointed to preach the Fatherhood of God and the Gospel of eternal hope, is

* Pp. 8 and 12.

a popular and more than ordinarily respectable and influential representative of this class. Don't his books almost invariably do violence to the conception of the Divine Fatherhood as taught by Christ? Do they not constantly lose sight, unintentionally, let it be charitably supposed, of the holy and righteous, the ethical and spiritual elements which belong to God's character, as Holy Father? Do they not minimize sin, soften punishment into chastisement, penalty into reformatory discipline, and reduce the meaning of the work of Christ to that of a moral influence—a theory which has long been felt to be one-sided and inadequate and not quite candid in its New Testament exegesis? In preaching or writing of the Fatherhood of God the work of Christ accordingly must be duly recognized. In the Scriptural representations of the truth there is certainly much prominence given to the basis laid for human pardon and salvation by the work of Christ. The Cross is the Divine expedient by which the Father's love might be freely extended to sinners, and the holiness of His character remain intact and unabridged.

The *second* qualifying truth to be remembered in the proclamation of the universal Fatherhood of God, is that while on the divine side the relationship eternally holds, on the human side it must be freely and voluntarily realized. In a true and real sense God is and forever remains, the Father of all men, but only those who, by making the divine life their willing choice and thus grow into likeness of the Divine character realize their higher sonship. Thus a man who is by nature a son of God comes to be a son of God in conscious filial relation with Him. Simply to use the name Father, as it is to be feared is often done, without feeling the necessity of ethical and spiritual affinity between son and Parent, amounts to nothing except self-deception. Those who call upon the Father in spirit and in truth, and who by faith assimilate the life and character of Him who realized sonship in perfection, those and those only come to be "the children," in the loftiest sense of Christ's words "of the Father which is in heaven." Of the realized bliss of that relationship those who are covetous, untruthful, sensual, profane,

proud, envious, uncompassionate, intemperate, unbelieving, unfaithful, revengeful, devilish, know nothing. They are not children of the heavenly Father. To tell them that they were, instead of calling them as Jesus did the like of them, by their right name, would obscure the necessity of real ethical and spiritual character for divine sonship. It would lower moral claims and encourage spiritual indifference. It would give criminal support to a fatal delusion. It would disregard the solemn call of the Gospel, to righteous living. It could be done only by suppressing some of the most awful warnings of prophets and apostles, and of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. And it would paralyze the urgency of those mighty motives which should induce men to make it the supreme end and aim of life to be Christ-like children of the Father who is in heaven thus availing themselves of the great inheritance to which the Gospel invites them all.

III.

ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.

BY REV. T. J. HACKER.

The human race may be conceived of as parcelled out into a number of distinct groups or societies, differing largely it is true in numbers, in civilization, intelligence and morals; but all are alike in so far that each and all are governed by certain well defined rules of conduct which determine to a greater or less extent the relation of the society as such to its members or constituency, and in turn, of the members thereof to themselves, to one another and to the body politic. Such rules of conduct whether written or unwritten, whether having their origin in vague traditions of the past or whether recently enacted by the highest intelligence, whether governing the semibarbarous horde or obtaining in civilized life, have all the force of and really constitute *Law*.

Laws are contrivances for bringing about certain definite ends. In the social order for instance, they become contrivances for the protection of man in the enjoyment of life, liberty and happiness; under such protective power man may develop these desirable conditions to their highest possible form both for himself and for posterity; the limit being found only when the law itself ceases to comprehend man's happiness on the one hand or its own protecting force on the other.

All laws obtaining in the social economy are not permanent for all time; on the contrary they are changeable and changing. Human intelligence and finite wisdom in the producing of law, may learn from the past, meet the needs of the present and even comprehend the immediate future, but man cannot legislate for all time with its unknown future contingencies; here man surrenders to his own finite limitations. The environment of circumstances, or a process of historical development in the civil or

religious life of a people may stamp certain laws as obsolete in fact while as to form and contents they still possess the force of law; under such changed conditions the demand will be made for a restatement of the code governing the body politic, in order to meet existing conditions. No law or code of laws however wise and good can withstand the inherent forces and demands of a true historic development. In reviewing the history of jurisprudence we are confronted again and again with such normal and at times even radical changes in the law governing the society or body, which apart from their protecting power for the time being, also become potent historical forces for the further development of the society whether civil or religious. Such changes, indirectly furnish the evidence for the fact that law as such is not permanent.

All laws are commands issued by a superior or sovereign to an inferior. The sovereign power to make, administer and execute law may reside in one person, in a limited number of persons or in the body itself considered as a separate society. A law then is a command or order issued by a superior to an inferior; it is an expressed wish or desire, with this peculiarity, viz:—that the party to whom the command or desire is expressed is liable to evil in case of noncompliance with the command. Being liable to evil in the event of negligence or willful disobedience, the individual is bound by the *command* or rather lies under the *duty* to render obedience to it. The evil referred to is called a *sanction*, and the command involved in law is said to be sanctioned by the chance of incurring evil. The terms command, duty and sanction are thus inseparably connected and involved in the idea of law.

While all laws are commands it does not follow that all commands are clothed with the dignity of law. A command to your servant to rise at six o'clock on a particular morning is a distinct command but it is not a law. A command to the same servant to always arise at six o'clock in the morning becomes a rule of conduct and therefore a law. A resolution passed by a body, clothed with legislative authority, comprehending a specific case

may have all the dignity of a command ; but when the command involved affects all similar cases looking into the future, then the resolution carries with it all the force of law and the body adopting such resolution assumes the responsibility of enacting a law. Again, we distinguish between laws and positive laws. Laws set by subjects in consequence of legal rights are clothed with legal sanctions and therefore become positive laws. A law set by a guardian to his ward in pursuance of a legal right which the guardian is bound to exercise, is a positive law pure and simple ; on the other hand when the rules or laws of a club or beneficial society operate to the exclusion of one or more of its members, such exclusion is according to law, that is, the law of the club or society, but not in pursuance of any legal right and therefore such rules or laws are not positive. For the greater convenience and efficiency of administration, law as such is classified into several distinct groups ; civil, criminal, marine, constitutional, international and ecclesiastical. These several groups although differing largely as to contents, jurisdiction and methods of administration, do not enter into conflict the one with the other but being mutually interdependent they thus complement each other. To illustrate ; any society of Christian people may ordain and administer laws for their own government, and the laws of the State in turn will protect such society in the enjoyment of its self-imposed privileges and duties ; the only limitation being that no part of such ecclesiastical law shall stand opposed to the organic law of the State. On the other hand the State carefully observes the unwritten law of refraining from such enactments of law that would do violence to the moral or religious sense of its constituency. The laws of the State uphold, defend and protect the Church in the administration of its ecclesiastical polity and the church in turn by virtue of her producing power along the lines of sound morals and correct social ethics upholds the State in the administration of its polity. The people are the source of all power in the affairs of state ; the excellency of the laws governing the commonwealth depend upon personal virtue and character of the people. The dynamic force of the Church becomes an im-

religious life of a people may stamp certain laws as obsolete in fact while as to form and contents they still possess the force of law; under such changed conditions the demand will be made for a restatement of the code governing the body politic, in order to meet existing conditions. No law or code of laws however wise and good can withstand the inherent forces and demands of a true historic development. In reviewing the history of jurisprudence we are confronted again and again with such normal and at times even radical changes in the law governing the society or body, which apart from their protecting power for the time being, also become potent historical forces for the further development of the society whether civil or religious. Such changes, indirectly furnish the evidence for the fact that law as such is not permanent.

All laws are commands issued by a superior or sovereign to an inferior. The sovereign power to make, administer and execute law may reside in one person, in a limited number of persons or in the body itself considered as a separate society. A law then is a command or order issued by a superior to an inferior; it is an expressed wish or desire, with this peculiarity, viz:—that the party to whom the command or desire is expressed is liable to evil in case of noncompliance with the command. Being liable to evil in the event of negligence or willful disobedience, the individual is bound by the *command* or rather lies under the *duty* to render obedience to it. The evil referred to is called a *sanction*, and the command involved in law is said to be sanctioned by the chance of incurring evil. The terms command, duty and sanction are thus inseparably connected and involved in the idea of law.

While all laws are commands it does not follow that all commands are clothed with the dignity of law. A command to your servant to rise at six o'clock on a particular morning is a distinct command but it is not a law. A command to the same servant to always arise at six o'clock in the morning becomes a rule of conduct and therefore a law. A resolution passed by a body, clothed with legislative authority, comprehending a specific case

may have all the dignity of a command ; but when the command involved affects all similar cases looking into the future, then the resolution carries with it all the force of law and the body adopting such resolution assumes the responsibility of enacting a law. Again, we distinguish between laws and positive laws. Laws set by subjects in consequence of legal rights are clothed with legal sanctions and therefore become positive laws. A law set by a guardian to his ward in pursuance of a legal right which the guardian is bound to exercise, is a positive law pure and simple ; on the other hand when the rules or laws of a club or beneficial society operate to the exclusion of one or more of its members, such exclusion is according to law, that is, the law of the club or society, but not in pursuance of any legal right and therefore such rules or laws are not positive. For the greater convenience and efficiency of administration, law as such is classified into several distinct groups ; civil, criminal, marine, constitutional, international and ecclesiastical. These several groups although differing largely as to contents, jurisdiction and methods of administration, do not enter into conflict the one with the other but being mutually interdependent they thus complement each other. To illustrate ; any society of Christian people may ordain and administer laws for their own government, and the laws of the State in turn will protect such society in the enjoyment of its self-imposed privileges and duties ; the only limitation being that no part of such ecclesiastical law shall stand opposed to the organic law of the State. On the other hand the State carefully observes the unwritten law of refraining from such enactments of law that would do violence to the moral or religious sense of its constituency. The laws of the State uphold, defend and protect the Church in the administration of its ecclesiastical polity and the church in turn by virtue of her producing power along the lines of sound morals and correct social ethics upholds the State in the administration of its polity. The people are the source of all power in the affairs of state ; the excellency of the laws governing the commonwealth depend upon personal virtue and character of the people. The dynamic force of the Church becomes an im-

perative necessity in moulding such personal virtue and high sense of personal honor. The church needs the protection of the State and the State needs the moulding power of the church. In these facts lies the true idea of the union or rather of the interrelation of church and State, each one governing itself it is true, and that without interference from the other, and yet in turn each recognizing and complementing the other, in order to the general and greater welfare of the constituency of both.

Confining ourselves to the discussion of ecclesiastical law in contradistinction from other groups we find that during all periods of the history of the church she enacted for herself rules of conduct and discipline which assumed and performed the various functions of law. The rules enacted by the early church defining its relations with the secular power, its own internal administration or the conduct of its members, were called *canons* in contradistinction on the one hand to its articles of faith and doctrine and on the other, to the enactments of the civil lawgiver. Though at first applied only to the ordinances enacted by a proper assembly of the church, the term canon came to be extended gradually to include the opinions of the church Fathers and the decretals of the Popes. Any collection of such rules, opinions and decisions came to be styled Canon Law. The earliest collection of church law pure and simple known to us is found in the spurious work entitled the Apostolic Constitutions, in eight books, dating from the close of the third to the first quarter of the fourth century. They contain a variety of simple, plain, moral rules and liturgical precepts together with a number of disciplinary regulations. From these we infer that the church at this period of her history was impelled by her internal condition to formulate such laws for her own purity and protection; and yet it will be observed the church held herself strictly to her own spiritual domain by confining her enactments to her specific needs. Later on, when the Eastern Canons were formulated during the fifth century, and the Western Canons compiled in the sixth century and as the church grew in numbers, influence and power, we notice a gradual expansion of the scope of Canon

law. The codes of nations were rapidly rendered obsolete by the introduction of Christianity and the teaching of the Gospel with its higher conceptions of the ethical relations of man. To the decisions of the Church Councils were added from time to time the opinions of Bishops and the decisions of the Popes. The church instead of maintaining her true spiritual character by legislation for her internal development within her proper sphere took cognizance of temporal conditions and reached forth the strong arm of her power in order to mould national life into higher and better conditions, more conformable to the spirit of Christianity. The object was unquestionably good, but the methods employed were dangerous to the true life of the church; instead of moulding the life and character of the people to a proper conception of correct principles of good government, the church considered herself as the source of all law and sought, often by violent interference, to enforce laws of her own enacting to attain her laudable object.

The twelfth century finds the church in possession of a number of codes of Canon laws formulated at different times and in several countries, and yet made homogeneous by the interpreting power of the pope and the administration of the Ecclesiastical Courts. Bologna University at this time had two faculties of law, a Civil and a Canon law faculty. In fact the conditions of the times demanded the judicature of Ecclesiastical courts as well as Civil courts and the church being supplied with a well educated class of lawyers from the universities for administering the Canon law in the Ecclesiastical courts, we are prepared for the gradual elevation of the Canon law to an equality with the Civil law and for the equally gradual yet sure supersedure of the former over the latter, both as to comprehensiveness of its enactments and wide scope of its judicature. The evolution of Canon law and its administration was gradual but steady; the primitive Christians in pursuance of apostolic precept (I Cor. 6: 1-6) submitted their differences and disputes to their bishops; and it was ordained by several of the early councils that questions arising between members of the church

should be settled by a spiritual tribunal. This jurisdiction by the bishops was extended by Constantine to all matters whether religious or secular, provided that both contending parties agreed to submit to the decision rendered. This principle was confirmed by later emperors but with the reservation, that the bishops sentence or decision could only be executed by invoking the civil power. In course of time the church courts absorbed many departments of civil jurisdiction; all matters connected however remotely with the church or religious duties were deemed proper subjects for the enactment of Canon laws and of disposal by the tribunals of the church. The clergy dispensed the sacraments and their services were required at baptisms, marriages and deaths; hence the church took cognizance of questions relating to legitimacy, marriage and succession. In the department of criminal law these courts were particularly active, punishing severely all sorts of heresy and sacrilege as well as adultery, bigamy, fraud and perjury. In order to all this, however, an enlarged code of Canon laws was enacted and in all fairness we must admit that by comparison with the then existing laws the Canons of the church were far superior both as to contents and design. In fact it was by no means an evil at that period of European history that the administration of the law came to be exercised by the clergy, who were the best educated men of their time and many of whom had a lawyer's training in the schools of Bologna and Paris. The Teutonic and Gothic codes particularly were very imperfect in most branches of the law and the mode of procedure in both civil and criminal cases was far from settled. The criminal law was little more than a system of fines. Evidence as we understand it was unknown and innocence could only rely for protection on compurgation, ordeal, or judicial combat. All this was gradually changed by the Canon law and to it we must look for the origin of many of the fundamental principles of existing law and order. To these Canon laws is directly traceable the foundation obtaining both in international and constitutional law; in fact the church may be said to have originated both. The ancient Romans regarded

all foreigners as *hostes*, the principles of Christianity as interpreted by the church in the enactment of its laws inculcated the idea of the Brotherhood of Nations. The popes often served as arbitrators between Prince and Prince as well as between Prince and people. They protected the weak against the encroachments of the strong and right as over against might. The principle was announced that any question of an international character should be decided according to law and Christian morality and that even war, when inevitable, should be conducted according to certain rules, formulated in the interests of a common humanity. The constitutional duties of a sovereign to his subjects was clearly defined by the Canon law of the church. Kings were instructed that there were obligations for the discharging of which they were responsible before God, and if these duties were neglected they rendered themselves liable to the severest punishment for kings, viz: their subjects might be absolved from their allegiance. So clear and definite were the expressions of the Canon law upon this subject that in later times the enemies of the papacy drew their most cogent argument and effective weapons from these very laws. The Canon law taken as a whole was not so much an independent system of law but rather a compilation of what was best from existing codes and transforming the whole by the help of Christian morality and judgment into a homogeneous code. The Canon law was well adapted to the civilization of the Middle Ages and the decline of its far-reaching power kept pace with that of the church from which it had its origin. The strife of popes and anti-popes, the increasing strength of national life, the arrogance of the Ecclesiastical courts on the one hand and the stupendous change in the domain of thought and the life of nations effected by the Reformation, all were prejudicial to the continued authority of Canon law. It was but natural that a system claiming to regulate the most important concerns of practical life, administered by courts which, though belonging to different nations were under the control of one central authority, should clash violently with the Reformation principles in religion no less than with the growing self-con-

sciousness of national life. From the Reformation period on, nations rapidly formulated laws for the highest interests of their subjects independent of the papacy and the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical courts; so that now Canon law possesses but little interest except of a historical or scientific character.

The Canon Law had the church for its *source* both of authority and administration. The church as sovereign extended her influence beyond the spiritual domain into all departments of social life. The true value of the Common law should not be underestimated, the righteousness of its fundamental principles is unquestioned and they remain with us under different forms unto the present; but the church committed a grave error when she made herself the source of law, and its administration, for all departments of human activity, instead of maintaining her authority within the limits of her own proper spiritual sphere.

Ecclesiastical Law on the contrary, looks upon the church as its proper *subject*; holds itself strictly within the lines of its own domain, the church; does not interfere with other codes of law either civil or criminal, and rests content as a servant of the Gospel to build up and strengthen the kingdom of Christ among men. Ecclesiastical law generally means the law of the church in countries where an established religion is recognized by the State, but in a more general sense and as used in this country, the term includes the whole body of the law relating to religion.

Limiting ourselves to the discussion of the laws that are operative in the government of the church in this country we notice that the various denominations or organized societies of believers may, so far as their governmental polity is concerned, be grouped into either one of the following three systems, viz: Episcopalian, Presbyterian or Congregational. Each one of these systems has its distinctive features which operate to separate it from the other systems; yet while each stands independent there is neither antagonism nor confusion since each system recognizes the limit of its judicature to the society adopting the system, and the same holds true as to the scope of its enactments and the administration of its laws. In each of these systems of ecclesiastical gov-

ernment we seek first in order, to discover the sovereign power or source of authority; that is, the authority to ordain and administer the law inherent in the system and dominating the entire society or denomination. The sovereign under the Episcopalian system is found in the individual styled a Bishop; who, by virtue of his office, can ordain, administer and execute the law governing the society over which he is placed, he alone holds the power of ordination, and he has in subordination under him priests or presbyters and deacons, with the power of removal; in fact the only limitation to his authority lies in the extent of territory over which he has jurisdiction. The logical culmination of this system of ecclesiastical government is found in one supreme head or sovereign for the entire world, in other words the idea of the papacy. This sovereign holds both the legislative and administrative functions of government and acts also as the sole interpreter of the law; his authority and power are absolute, and his decisions are unquestioned by the faithful. A limited Episcopal form of government is found in the Protestant Episcopal and Methodist Episcopal churches of this country. Here the source of authority as centered in the bishop is met and neutralized by a force or element of power springing from the clergy and laity; and these two, working in well defined lines, become the co-ordinate source of authority or the sovereign power. Of the Episcopalian system it may be said that it stands as the embodiment of the idea of centralization of power. The direct opposite to this is found in the Congregational system. The Baptist and Congregational churches are governed by this system. The essence of this system is found in the idea of the spiritual equality of believers together with the right and duty of every member to have a voice in the deliberations and decisions of the church. Each congregation thus becomes a law unto itself with full legislative and administrative powers. While repudiating all restraints of law operating from without upon the congregation, yet it is insisted on that the laws governing the churches become the exponent of their highest form of religious life. Without discussing the merits of this or any other system and holding

ourselves to our inquiry, we find the sovereign or source of authority in this system in the individual congregation. Each congregation stands for itself and is not amenable to any higher ecclesiastical court or judicatory; neither is the action or law of any one congregation in the least binding upon any other. All power being vested in the congregation there may be any amount of difference as to practice and custom, rules and regulations and the system even permits diversity of doctrinal views. The only bond of union, legally speaking, that holds congregationalism together is the unwritten law of holding the system as such. The Congregational Union and the Baptist Annual Conference are bodies regularly constituted by their respective denominations, but without legislative or judicial authority; organized for the promotion of close fraternal relations between the churches, gathering of statistics and the discussion of matters of general interest, they none the less exert a moulding influence, resulting at least in a general uniformity of doctrine and practice in what they are pleased to term the essentials of religion.

The Presbyterian system of ecclesiastical government stands opposed to centralization of power and authority on the one hand, and protests against a diffusion of sovereign power among the individual congregations of the church on the other. This system began at the Reformation and attained development only in the churches commonly called Reformed. As early as 1526 attempts were made to formulate a system for the government of the Reformed churches, but nothing was accomplished until Calvin brought order out of chaos by developing a system of government, the vertebræ of which remain unto the present day and the foundation principles of which are "(1) A separate ministry is an ordinance of God. (2) Ministers duly called and ordained may alone preach and administer sacraments. (3) A legitimate ministry is one where suitable persons are appointed with the consent of the people, but that other pastors should preside over the election to guard against intrigue and confusion; the final act of ordination being confined to the pastors. (4) To coöperate with the pastors there should be governors selected from the people to

join with the pastors in exercising discipline." From Eph. 4: 11, *sq.* Rom. 12: 7, and I Cor. 12: 28, he deduced five orders, "of which three—apostles, prophets and evangelists—were extraordinary and had lapsed, but two—pastors and doctors—were for all time. Doctors are concerned only with interpretation and exposition, pastors with preaching, sacraments and discipline. From the pastors some are singled out (I Tim. 5: 17), called and ordained to "labor in the word," to occupy themselves in *fixed* charges, with preaching and the administering of the sacraments; while the rest are invested with jurisdiction in the correction of manners and with the care of the poor. For although Christ gave to the whole congregation the power of excommunication, yet the crowd was not to rule, lest arbitrariness and confusion enter." Calvin's system, while preserving the democratic theory in so far as it recognized the congregation as the holder of power, was in practice strictly aristocratic, inasmuch as the congregation is never allowed any direct use of that power, which is vested in the whole body of presbyters, that is, ministers and elders.

Passing over the interesting history incident to the development of this form of church government we find that it stands for constitutional government. The system requires a constitution under which we find a number of church courts for its proper administration; the clergy and the people have equal representation, neither standing independent of the other, both being necessary to constitute any one of these church courts. Taking the Reformed Church in the United States as an illustration we find that the interests of the individual congregation, with certain rights reserved (such as the purchase or sale of property, the creating of a debt, etc.), are committed to the officers of the congregation consisting of Elders and Deacons chosen directly by the people, the officers thus chosen together with the pastor constitute the Consistory or lowest church court. The next in order is the Classis, composed of all the ministers and representative Elders from each pastoral charge within a given territory. A Synod is composed of the delegates, both clerical and lay, elected

by the Classis within a given territory and the General Synod or highest church court is composed of an equal number of delegates, clerical and lay, chosen by all the Classes in the entire denomination.

When we come to look for the sovereign or source of authority in the Reformed Church we find it vested, not as might be thought at first glance in the General Synod or the District Synods and still less so in the Consistory, but in the Classis. The Classis examines men and passes upon their fitness for the office of the ministry and ordains them to that holy office. It organizes, fosters and establishes congregations and provides for their highest and best interests, particularly when there is a temporary vacancy. Furthermore, when the Classes, in providing for the general welfare of the denomination, concede certain rights, privileges and powers to Synod and General Synod, it is for the better administration of the interest of the entire denomination. The relation of the Classis to the congregation and membership of the church is close, intimate and vital; the relation of the Classis to the Synod and General Synod is official more than intimate. The power of Synods and General Synods is largely advisory only; their authority for legislation and administration is decidedly limited. The Synod and General Synod exist only through the sovereign will of the Classis. The Classis alone has the power of veto, and that so absolutely and finally that no higher church court can pass any action over the veto of the Classis. The Classes alone have the power to amend, change or even annul the organic law of the church. By way of parenthesis it may be noted, that all the attempts made within recent years, to procure a New Constitution for the Reformed Church have failed, not so much because of the veto power exercised by the Classes, but for the reason that the General Synod has failed to recognize the fact, that the only power to *produce* such new organic law is vested absolutely and directly in the Classes. The same authority and absolute right to veto a proposed law possesses the inherent right to create law. The Classis is the sovereign power and source of authority in the Reformed Church. Remove this sovereign power

upward to the General Synod and you approach Episcopalian centralization ; remove it downward to the Consistory and you approach Congregationalism. Not that we have any criticism for either ; they are recognized systems of ecclesiastical government, but if the Reformed Church desires to be governed by the Presbyterian system we need to hold firmly to its central idea, viz., government by Presbyters ; and we need to understand that the true sovereign of the system is found in the Classis or Presbytery.

The organic law of a denomination holding the Presbyterian system of ecclesiastical government is usually found in a written instrument styled a constitution. If we take the accepted definition of a law as being a command imposed by the sovereign upon a subject, the constitution would consist of the rules or laws which first point out clearly where the sovereign is to be found, the form in which his powers are to be exercised, and the relations of the members of the sovereign body to each other when it consists of more persons or factors than one. In every independent denomination it is assumed by these definitions there will be found somewhere or other a sovereign ; whether that sovereign be a single individual, a limited number of persons or several bodies of persons. The commands imposed by the sovereign person or body on the rest of the society or denomination are positive laws properly so called. The sum of such positive laws become the one organic law or constitution of the denomination. It is important therefore that such constitution should express in clear, concise propositions the fundamental principles or laws governing the entire body.

Too often we find the organic law of a denomination encumbered with details which do not properly belong to a constitution as such ; but have their proper place under the department of rules governing the judicatories in their proceedings. Article seventy-one of the Constitution of the Reformed Church is a case in point, as compared with article sixty-seven of the same constitution which declares a vital principle of law. Again, a part or parts of a constitution may be susceptible of various interpreta-

tions because of ambiguous language or want of clear, explicit statement. This needs to be guarded against when we keep in view the fact, that constitutional law as such, needs to be broad and fundamental in order not to hinder proper legislation under its provisions and yet concise and clear enough in statement as to avoid confusion of interpretation, jurisdiction or administration. The sovereign body not only creates law but has two other leading functions, viz., judicature and administration. Legislation under a constitution is generally conducted by the sovereign body itself; and when legislative power in whole or in part is delegated to higher or other bodies, its acts become advisory merely until enacted into law by the sovereign body. The sovereign body usually delegates the right of judicature and administration, but under the Presbyterian system of ecclesiastical government such delegation of power is made with clearly reserved rights or equally clearly defined limitations.

The constitution of a denomination accordingly should show very clearly how the various judicatories or church courts are composed, their rights and privileges as well as relations to one another clearly defined, and more particularly how the sovereign functions of legislation, judicature and administration are exercised. Constitutional law under this system consists of the rules relating to these subjects, and the rules may either be laws properly so called or they may not, *i. e.*, they may or may not be commands imposed by the sovereign body. There may be rules which have been generally observed in practice, but have never been enacted into a positive law by the sovereign body. Take for example the rule of installing a minister over his charge; it has become the universal rule of the church, but there is no positive law upon the subject; or, when the Synod apportions certain sums of money among the Classes for the furtherance of the various benevolent objects of the church, the rule has been that the Classes accept such apportionment; but the non-acceptance would not be illegal since the rule has not been enacted into law, involving consequent sanctions, by the sovereign body.

It is of grave importance in ecclesiastical law that the jurisdic-

tion of every particular church court be clearly set forth and defined. The line clearly drawn where and when the decision of a Classis or Synod should be final. The right of appeal preserved inviolate with a clear distinction however, as between the cases that merit the right of appeal to the highest church court, and those of minor importance which should not be appealed except for technic error. The distinction should be clearly set forth where the fact of an appeal should operate as a stay of proceedings or sentence and where it should not. Furthermore, when a case is once decided by a church court, a complete history of the case together with the findings of the court should be made and filled, in order that when similar cases come before the same court they may be decided by and upon the precedent already made. This will not only economize time, ensure equity, but will prove an effectual bar to the multiplication of cases that might prove merely vexatious.

In the enactment of any ecclesiastical law or in its administration, the church needs to keep in view first, the great object of such law, viz: the discipline of life for her internal development and, the maintenance of order in the body politic together with fostering care and superintendence, for her external growth; second, that all ecclesiastical law, whether constitutional or not, is but the servant of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. As the servant is not above his master, so ecclesiastical law is not above the Gospel but subordinate to it. The Gospel is paramount—is master. The very first aspect of the Gospel is a manifestation of intense, sovereign, triumphant love; in order to which there is a response, on the part of man, in returning love, in part at least under the form of obedience. Ecclesiastical law as an humble servant of the Gospel seeks to foster this spirit of obedience. All law, whether ecclesiastical or other, that is at variance with the eternal verities of the Word of God operates as a hindrance to the development of a true spiritual life in the individual and in the social order. Any law or code of laws whose object it is to serve the Gospel in maintaining its verities and advancing its interests becomes an organic force for the uplift of the race.

All laws are but means to an end. In this matter, to the end that, man in obedience thereto may actualize comfort for himself, happiness for his neighbor and love for his maker, God. In the economy of the church, ecclesiastical law in its enactments stands for the advancement of the Kingdom of Christ among men both intensive and extensive and in its administration for the greater glory of Christ the Head of the Church.

IV.

THE DECLINE OF THE CHURCHES—SOME CAUSES AND REMEDIES.

BY REV. E. P. WISE.

Church statistics indicate a falling off in church attendance and church membership. The New York *Independent* publishing, for 1899, the statistics of forty-nine religious bodies, gives only eight as making an increase above two per cent. Five bodies made an actual decrease, running as high as 9 per cent. This leaves thirty-six bodies making an increase ranging from two-tenth per cent. to two per cent. The total increase for the year, in these forty-nine bodies, is 4,581 ministers, 421 churches, 277,367 members and an average gain of one per cent.

Statistics do not always tell the whole story. Other evidences force us to the conclusion, however, that these statistics do not give a false impression. It is plain that the leaders in various denominations are not satisfied with the present rate of increase, and are seeking a remedy. Dr. James M. Buckley says: "That the Methodist Church should add less than 7,000 to its membership, in 1899, is startling. That in the same period it should show a decline of 28,595 in probationers is ominous." The appeal of the Bishops of that Church indicates the feeling of apprehension. The small gains in seven of the other bodies is also giving concern. Dr. H. K. Carroll, LL.D., commenting on recent statistics, says: "It is evident that all churches are passing through a period of unusual dullness. As a whole they are making progress, but slowly."

It is contended by some that the increase of church membership is greater than the increase in population. Taking into view the entire century, or even the last decade, this is true. At the present period it is not true, as statistics prove. Beside, the margin

of non-church members attending church has been steadily decreasing. Increase in membership is not alone a sufficient index of the church's influence with the whole people. Says Josiah Strong: "It has been quite possible for the church to grow more rapidly than the population, while at the same time it was losing its hold on the multitudes." We have been known as a church-going people; few appreciate to what extent we have now become a non-church-going people. An extensive canvass in many states indicates that probably 30 per cent. of our people are regular attendants upon churches, that perhaps 20 per cent. are irregular attendants and that fully 50 per cent. of the people of the United States never attend church at all. The growing separation between the church and the people is appreciated by the great leaders in the church. Not very long before his death Mr. Moody said: "The gulf between the church and the masses is growing deeper, wider and darker every hour." The reality of such a gulf is not a matter of opinion; it is supported by statistics and wide observation.

The question at issue is, is the church as an organization losing its hold upon the masses and is the present rate of numerical increase discouraging? There is no question as to the deepening of the spiritual life of many who are now church adherents, the increased interest in Bible study, the enlarged sphere of missionary enterprise, the multiplication and development of benevolent institutions. The spirit of Christ is leavening the lump of society. But the evidence is overwhelming that the church is not *now* gaining numerically. It is like a great army on the march coming to a halt, still marking time but making no advance.

In this state of things there is cause for alarm. It is a question that may well engage the serious attention of every one who is interested in the welfare of Zion, the salvation of souls and the uplift of society. True, numbers in themselves do not count with God. Quality not quantity is His standard. "One shall chase a thousand and two ten thousand." Lyman Abbott said to a company of young preachers in Boston: "You want large audiences to preach to. That is well. But it is not so important

how many you preach to, as how much of God you put into those to whom you preach." This is true and yet, other things being equal, the larger the number the Church reaches, the better. Although we want high quality we want large numbers as well. Nothing is more apparent in the records of early day Christianity than the fact that *multitudes* were converted. "The Lord added daily such as were being saved." "Many of them which heard the Word believed; and the number of them was about five thousand." "And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women." The multitudes ought to be reached now. That so few are converted and so few seek the services of the church make it evident that something is wrong somewhere. No man of faith will conclude that the present condition will continue. The church will find the causes and the remedy and will go forward again with conquering power. Let not the righteous be discouraged but be alert as to causes and remedies.

The causes are not to be found on the divine side of things. God is still all-mighty and all-loving. Jesus Christ is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." The Holy Spirit is in the church now as formerly and just as able to "convict men of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment." The cause is hardly to be sought among the unsaved. The world is no more sinful than formerly. The obstacles in the way of reaching men, though different in character, are no more formidable. True, men are absorbed in their daily pursuits. Wealth has become a great idolatry. Social conditions are exceedingly exacting. People are brutalized by the long hours and the many days of toil, so that little time, strength or inclination is left them for spiritual things. The newspaper, the magazine and the popular novel are indeed threatening the power of the pulpit and the church. The theater multiplies its allurements without elevating its tone. Yet all of these are no adequate explanation of the church's apparent loss of power. Deep down in men's hearts there is a conscious longing, which nothing but the spiritual verities of the Gospel can satisfy. *A priori* one would think that as the world becomes more intelligent and its need therefore more defined, the power of

the church over men's minds would increase. Some causes for its limping influence must exist within the church.

The problem has recently been many times dissected and the seat of the disease variously located. The church, the individual and society as a whole, have each been given a share of the blame. Yet whatever may be due to the mad passion for worldly success, to the idolatry of wealth, to ignorance of the Bible, to the power of the saloon, the encroachments of a worldly life and the decline of the home, the church ought to have such power within itself—in its preaching, its worship, its social life—as to overcome all obstacles and powerfully move the masses. The founder of Christianity had great power with the people and promised His followers greater success than He had attained. Were the church like its Master not only would its spirit flow into the body of society, but the church would multiply its adherents at a rate to warrant the final success of the kingdom of God. It is evident that for the final causes and remedies we must look to the church itself.

The first of these causes is the lack of quality in the church. People do not look at the church as an institution but at its individual representatives. They judge goods by the samples. Church membership must not be made a nominal affair regardless of character. The church must manifest itself as an institution that does impart life and power. *Character not standing* must be the result of discipleship. Too much has been made of the imputation and not enough of the *impartation* and *assimilation*, of Christ's righteousness. "What are these people, what do they, more than we," is the world's question. Our zeal to add to the church, commendable in degree but unwise in method, loading it down with unregenerate material, has defeated our very purpose. The church must wisely and effectively bring men to the acceptance of Christ, then by its methods of spiritual culture help them—increase their knowledge, inspire them to better things, sustain them in noble undertakings and reënforce them in the struggle for righteousness. Quality was the secret of the church's power in the first century. Because they continued in

the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, in breaking bread and prayer, and were therefore pious, God-fearing, united, joyous, and unselfish, so that no man could say that he lacked any necessity, therefore the Lord added daily such as were being saved. Later it is recorded that the churches had rest and were edified, and, walking in the fear of the Lord and the help of the Holy Spirit, were multiplied. A deepened spiritual life and a correspondingly widened social spirit are indispensable conditions to its healthy multiplication. God's law in the physical kingdom is nutrition unto reproduction; in the spiritual it is edification unto multiplication. God never uses an unspiritual, selfish, worldly church to save men. Formerly because of the fine spiritual quality of the church one sermon converted 3,000 men, now it requires 3,000 sermons to convert one man.

The lack of dependence upon the Holy Spirit, a corollary to the above, may be named as one of the causes of declining power. We need a revival of sane and practical teaching on this subject. "The Help of the Holy Spirit" is mentioned by Luke as one of the conditions of success. Men like Moody, Spurgeon, Phinney, Gordon and Simpson, who have been conspicuously successful in reaching the people, placed great reliance upon the fellowship of the Spirit. On the one hand there is abroad a false idea of the Holy Spirit as a bygone fact, His presence remaining in the Word of God as Shakespeare's spirit remains in his words; on the other hand a vague notion of the Spirit as a mysterious, impersonal, elusive sort of entity pervading the church as ether does the atmosphere. There is lack of conviction concerning the Holy Spirit as a personal agent in the conversion of men, and an abiding, ever present and helpful friend, to the Christian. We should steer clear of theological confusions as to the methods of the Spirit and philosophical mysticism as to His essence, but we should emphasize the importance and power of the Spirit in individual and organized Christian life. I cannot forget that Jesus in His sermon in the chamber, the last of His discourses, in which He would likely emphasize the most important things, makes the Holy Spirit the most prominent

theme. I fear we have been missing the secret of power in reaching, holding and culturing men in the Gospel.

The lessening of the authority of the Bible is another source of weakness. This is largely the result of historical criticism. Criticism is not to be condemned *per se*; it has rendered a great service and its best fruits will be apparent in the future. In two ways, however, it has temporarily affected the authority of the Bible. The net result of the destructive criticism has been to destroy the divine element in the Book. The religion of the Jews, we are told, was a natural evolution. The prophets were men with great minds and clear visions. Judging by former causes and results they knew what would be the results of existing conditions. There is no predictive element in prophecy. There is something running through the Book which corresponds to the Word of God, but just what we are not told. This breaks down the authority of the Bible over the hearts of men. As to the work of the constructive critic, all this discussion about authorship, credibility and source of materials, gives the untaught masses the impression that there is something uncertain, if not doubtful, about the authority of the Bible. The final results of criticism are not to be feared. The Bible is the Word of God. It will endure all unfriendly attacks. Criticism itself will in the end establish more firmly the authority of the Bible. But while we are in the transition period letting go of some traditional ideas and trying to adjust ourselves to new conceptions the Book is suffering a temporary diminution of power. There is some force in the following statement made by Governor Rollins before the Boston Ministers' Union, relative to the decline of religion in the rural districts: "You clergymen are no longer the spiritual guides of the people, who now follow the religion of the newspaper. The ark has been overthrown, the Bible account of creation denied, Jonah repudiated and the anchor of the old faith pulled up before the sails are set for the new." In this time of transition there is need of a thoroughly educated, wise, conscientious ministry, as the spiritual guide to the people.

Another weakness is the lack of a christocentric plea in evan-

gelism and spiritual culture. Whatever has or has not happened, the world has swung Christward. In Bible study the thought is concentrated upon Christ as the great center of all Biblical history and literature. He is looked upon as the fountain of saving grace and spiritual culture. He is now recognized as the source of the highest ethics. Social reformers begin to admit that He is the hope of the world's social redemption. As President Bascom said: "The highest social principle must be taken from the lips of Jesus." Passing by all ecclesiastical government, theological systems and doctrinal explanations, the world is asking "what does Jesus say?" and "what would Jesus do?" The organized church has hardly kept pace with this christocentric movement. Our preaching has been too dogmatic, theological, ecclesiastical and sectarian. People have tired of hearing of "our church," "our denomination," "our branch of the church," and "our creed." They want to hear of "Christ," of the "church universal," of "the Kingdom of God," of "righteousness." It is the catholic spirit that will move the multitudes. There is a powerful trend, in human thought to-day, in the direction of unity and catholicity, with the person of Christ as the center and bond, and the church must keep itself in the way of the tide if it would be swept on to victory. The church must become more christocentric in its teaching and life.

There has been a lamentable failure on the part of the church to adjust itself to new conditions, new demands and new duties. The church must adapt its teaching and life to present day needs. We need no new revelation but a new application of old truths. New occasions bring new demands and, hence, new duties. Truth adequate for all ages and conditions, lies imbedded in the gospel; we must bring out of it the things that are needed in the present. New light is continually breaking from the Word of God, if we only put ourselves in the way of receiving and reflecting it. We are discovering the minerals of the earth as we need them; so will we discover in the Book the rich mines of truth as world conditions demand them. What the church needs is the spirit of life that brings growth and adaptation. Professor Briggs says

that "a large number of men absent themselves from church attendance because they dislike the popular orthodoxy, which seems to them antiquated, unscientific and untrue." This is doubtless an overdrawn statement, but contains a large kernel of truth. It is not dogma but life that men are sighing for and only so much of doctrinal statement should be used as is needed to convey life, and that statement should conform to present needs. Evermore is it true that new wine must be put into new bottles. Christianity means life and if the gospel has free course it will always make for itself an outer shell such as it needs to accomplish its work.

The church must continually revise and adapt its phraseology. It still speaks in the language of a former age. Between the theologians and the scientists of the past century there has been no great difference; they simply have not understood each other. Many of their great truths are analogous; only in expressing them the one uses an obsolete phraseology, while the other speaks in the terms of an entirely new scientific speech. It is in this very thing that men like Professors Drummond and Fairburn, Drs. Dodds and Bruce have rendered a very great service. They have been doing the work of reconciliationists, standing between warring hosts and making peace. Their aim has been to translate christian truth into the dialect of the day, the vernacular of current thought. Christian truth is always the same, but the statement of it must needs differ. The things taught by theistic evolutionists are the things Jesus taught. The old truths expressed in the phraseology of modern thought will be at once apprehended and received. No better example of this can be found than that of St. John. His phraseology is quite different from all the other New Testament writers; it stands quite alone. He wrote later than the others, at a time when the Philonian philosophy was largely read and accepted, and was doing much harm. John met the teachings of this philosophy, for it was mystical Neo-Platonism, by showing that Jesus was in person the revelation of God, and that His works were the signs and His discourses the witnesses, of this greatest of all truths—"the word made flesh." And in doing it he used the terms and phrases of

that philosophy, and by thus adapting himself to the culture of the day he made himself intelligible and his influence far-reaching. I plead for a restatement of the old truths in the terms of modern thought.

The most serious thing in the church's failing to adapt itself to modern conditions is its lack of social sympathy. We have been so busy preparing for the kingdom beyond that we have failed to establish the kingdom here. Rest in the after-life rather than a new spirit of service for this life, has been the motive in the persuasion of men. We have been trying to teach men to realize the first part of the great command—"to love God," but not the second part—"to love our neighbor." Our partial teaching has made us religious but not social. The church has taken too little interest in the every-day sufferings of humanity and has lost the sympathy of great masses of laboring people. Preaching is an art and as such it is central and unifying. But while applying truth at the center it must so apply it as to affect the whole circumference of life. Christianity is worth little if it does not bring in a better social condition—a condition in which all men "shall have a just share in the things of this life." To this end the church must manifest its social sympathy so that while it teaches love to God it will exhibit love to man. It must inspire, direct, and perform, social service. In general it has shown so little interest in industrial conditions the causes and the iniquity of the unequal distribution of wealth and so little concern for the needs of the struggling masses, that these masses have concluded that the church cares little for them. Social reformers admit that Christ is the hope of their cause but declare that the church is their enemy. In a great labor meeting in New York when the church was mentioned the men hissed; when Christ was named they bowed their heads in reverence. This inexpressible loss of influence the church can regain only by the manifestation of a general and fearless social sympathy, I do not say that the church should advocate a definite social regime. No man is entitled to say what the final form of social organization will be, except that it will be a fitting instrument

for the service of perfect love. But it can show its sympathy, fearlessly declare a social righteousness that will bring repentance like that of Zaccheus, proclaim the gospel of love and apply it to all the relations of labor and capital. It can teach a social ethics that places the rights of men above the rights of property and altruism above selfishness. It can teach a new conception of religion that will lead men, not to attempt to save their souls by means of dogma, but to save them by pouring their own lives into the channels of an unselfish service in behalf of those "who suffer hunger, thirst, cry aloud in bitterness from the depths of crushing environment, lift their pale, wan faces to the brazen sky of social selfishness to discern one quivering rift of tenderness." When the great body of laboring people once feels assured that the church has practical sympathy for them and is ready to apply the Gospel to the great work of social regeneration, they will seek the church because the church will then be their best friend.

All this is said as an enthusiastic friend of the church. The church is the body of Christ and His chosen instrument in the saving of the world. He is its best friend, who is willing to see its present weaknesses and apply himself to the remedy. No fears are felt as to the final triumph of the kingdom of God. That the church may most speedily fulfill its mission in securing the full establishment of that kingdom we must lengthen our cords and strengthen our stakes. Errors must be eliminated and weaknesses overcome. If the church cultivates the spirit of its great Head, and the wisdom, power and adaptability of His truth, it will reach and save the multitudes.

V.

THE INSTITUTIONAL CHURCH.

BY REV. C. CLEVER, D.D.

One of the proudest boasts of the church, in the ages passed, has been its ability to adapt itself to every new condition that may arise. It has held fast to the faith that the same Providence that laid its foundation, prepares the field upon which it will achieve its sublimest triumphs. As the earth was prepared for man, before he came forth from the hand of the Creator, flushed with the dawn and purity of the morning, so the ground has been prepared from which the roots and stones must be plucked out, the stubborn glebe broken up and the good seed cast in. The forces to be subdued are in harmony with the hand and heart of Him who is to be its conquerer, as well as its crown and head. There was no schism between the ruler and the ruled. In the realm of the spiritual the same superintending wisdom, in a more pre-eminent degree, has shown itself so clearly, that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.

That the church is entering into new conditions, that must be permeated by her divine-human life, is evident to the most casual observer of the trend of affairs; if anarchy and bloodshed are not to run riot upon the face of the earth. The environment has entirely changed. The place of the church among the forces that are working so strenuously towards a millennial ideal is something vastly different from that ever occupied before. The church has never gone along this way. Its enemies and some of its friends assert, that it must be content to fill a much narrower sphere. The need for its message and worship has wilted before the splendid achievements of culture and science. With the spread of the power and influence of the state, and the successful evolution of new social forces, it must dwindle into such insignificant

proportions, that it will be swallowed up by the State. But to others, who are just as much interested in bringing in the better things, the changed conditions only furnish a wider arena for the manifestation of the powers lodged in the church by Jesus Christ, and constantly enlivened by His presence and power. If the church can become all things to all men for their salvation, there should be no doubt, or fear, that among all the forces of modern life her message of peace and good-will must still play an all important part. The busy world regards the church as having fallen into a rut, and being out of joint with the present. It would seem sometimes as if its particular mission was accounted to be to hurl anathemas at all that the present age regards with favorable consideration. "Religion, unlike its founder, who mixed freely with men, has been put off into a corner by itself. It has played the hermit. In the domain of amusement, for instance, it denounces or remains indifferent, while it leaves the field to Satan and his ever active emissaries."*

The environment being the result of the Providence who gives direction to the destinies of every age and the church being guided by the same hand for the advancement of his glory, we must believe that it will be equal to every emergency that can arise. In its effort to adapt itself to the new conditions there will be some severe shocks. To that which has remained unmoved in the seismic upheavals of former ages, it will seem as if the end of all things is at hand. Much stubborn resistance will mark those forms of life which have furnished consolation and courage to those who have borne the burden and heat of the glorious days that are past.

We are confronted to-day with a new conception of the mission of the church, in modern times. For this let us feel thankful and go forward with a joyful courage. The church has a wider outlook. It must slough off everything that will in any way hinder it from going up into the new inheritance that has been opened to the vision of its seers. They have been on the mountain top, and the sanctified vision has been world-wide.

* *Triumphs of the Cross*, p. 521.

They have not been called to fall down and worship Satan, and to receive as a reward all that has entranced them. Instead of this, they have heard the Master bid them go over and take possession of all in His name and for His glory. The seers have been on the housetop, and have seen the veil as it were a sheet let down from heaven, and filled with every kind of beast. They have heard that nothing is common or unclean. All aglow with fellowship with Christ and the spirit, they have vowed, with an oath, that they will count nothing foreign to them, but that all things can be permeated by the life of Christ and of God. There have been whole centuries when the church appeared to men as simply a society in which public "prayer and preaching were the supreme if not exclusive ratio essendi." The highest ideal was to get away as far as possible from every form of political or social life. The monastery became a necessary adjunct of the Christian life, and scholarship found genial encouragement alone, within its quiet walls. There was no room for reconstruction. Government, art and science were in such chaos that religious counsel and advice would have been casting pearls before swine. At such a time the stream of Christian influence looses itself in the cell, but not to waste itself away. Men are accumulating stores of knowledge, which will at last flow over sunny fields, and fructify the mighty nations that are yet to be. But all this is changed. The lines between the secular and sacred are narrowing, not, as pessimism asserts, because the sacred is being swallowed up by the secular, but because the secular is being permeated by the sacred. It is gradually dawning upon the mind of Christian leaders that there is power in the church by which the State can be transformed. The ideas of liberty, the inviolability of the right of personality, the sacredness of genius and the personal responsibility for every gift of body, soul and spirit, are becoming forces that religion has already transformed. For the fuller conquest of these, Jehovah commands all of our strength. The mission of the church is not to fit men for another world only, but also make them mete to live in this. It is not so much a question as to whether he shall be able to join in

the new song, but as to whether he is fit to handle the hoe, shove the plain, drive a horse, paint a picture, or preach a sermon. It may do to wile away an idle moment, speculating as to whether we shall know our friends in the other world. The sterner requirement, of the broader conception of the sphere of Christianity requires us to inquire far more seriously and prayerfully as to whether we know them here. "The church must appear now as a social state in which the spirit of Christ reigns, as embracing the general life and society of men and identifying itself with these as much as possible, as having for its object to imbue all human relations with the spirit of Christ's self-renouncing love, and thus to change the world into the kingdom of God."

The Institutional church recognizes that it must meet the legitimate demands of life in its widest sense. The times in which men live and move and have their being are more serious than ever before. It is a problem as to just how poor human nature will be able to bear up under the new responsibilities imposed upon it. Heart failures, nervous prostrations and paralysis are the threatening shadows which linger along every horizon. Men almost dread to bid good-bye to loved ones in the morning lest the hurry and stress of the day will break the pitcher at the fountain or the wheel at the cistern before they see them again. To meet this demand recreation must be afforded the strained nerves and hurrying heart-beat. These will not take the place of faith and worship in the development of character and the strengthening of courage, but will materially aid in preparing for the enjoyment of these essentials of Christian life. The ideal is puritanism in character, linked with a holy enjoyment. The social nature of mankind must be met. When the bow has been strung to its highest tension it must be relaxed. The playful side of human nature must be given its right, amid surroundings which will be conducive to a healthy development of manhood and womanhood. It is not possible for the home to furnish this. There must be a commingling of different phases of life to reach the highest enjoyment. The world has been ready to supply this demand, and the ragged and racked public has been quick to

respond. The extravagance in scenery and the questionable in play have conduced to debase public taste. The purveyors to this degenerate taste insist that the public demand it and that they are always ready to meet the demand.

The church will plead in vain to a public that must have recreation, to remain away from the theatre and play-house. Wearied human nature must have recreation, as much as food, or die. If it cannot find it amid surroundings favorable for the enlivening of all that is better in man, it will seek it elsewhere. If the thirsty stag cannot find the clear-flowing brook for which it languishes it will slake its passion in a stream that is tintured with poison. If men and women, hounded almost to death by the stress and storms of life will not be guided to the pure waters of healthy recreations, they will seek them elsewhere.

The institutional church recognizes this abounding need. The call is imperative and must be speedily answered or men die. Dr. Gladden says: "The Church which is described as Institutional is one which adds to the ordinary features of Church life a number of appliances not commonly regarded as ecclesiastical, such as gymnasia, reading rooms, amusement rooms and class rooms for instruction in science or literature, or music or art, or useful industries." The former portion of this description will meet the demand for recreation. It will enable the church to make the surroundings such that all classes of people will be made better, because of their coming under its spell.

Life is not made up entirely of recreation, and men have other needs that must be supplied. The parochial school supplied a want in its day. When it was superseded by the public school, there was a loss of immediate contact with the church. The Bible was soon found to be an incumbrance. All religious teaching was relegated to other forms of religious activity. Then, still further, the increasing demands of living, urges the boys and girls out into the hurly-burly of life, at a much earlier age. The increasing family necessitates the older members to become producers, rather than consumers, much earlier than formerly. The advantages of education are enjoyed in a very partial way.

Many who would shine as stars of the first magnitude, in the intellectual firmament, are early leashed to the earth, so firmly, that they cannot rise. They all need some test of science, art and literature to give spice to life. True, in every large city and town, institutes and educational work connected with Young Men's Christian Association favored with endowments, furnish opportunities for almost every form of intellectual development. But all this is more or less extraneous to the church. It does not permeate with its sanctifying power these streams that will bear on their surface some of the most darling interests of social and national life. The poor hardworked young man or woman is not feeling that the church has been the patroness of the institutions that have furnished them the means of getting up out of the low estate into which the hard stress of life had flung them as so much respectable wreckage.

In antebellum times there were hosts of slaves who came under the immediate personal influence of their masters. They counselled them when discouraged, nursed them when sick, and sheltered them when they were old. In a great corporation all this has been lost. Men are not touched by the life of those who direct the immense power placed in their hands by money and corporate interests. In the middle ages the church was the mother who cared for every form of life. Governments, schools, art and science felt its fostering help. It sometimes overstepped its proper bounds, and would not render unto Cæsar the things that were Cæsars, but without her influence felt in such an immediate way, the modern nations and conditions of which we so loudly boast, could not have been. While therefore the Reformation broke many shackles that unfortunately bound the human mind and crippled the development of the very things that had been so generously nurtured, it somewhat ruthlessly shattered things that should have remained. Education must be sanctified in order to be a saving power.

Revolutions are fostered, among the wise and the witty, when religion ceases to give directions to the pilot, who sits at the wheel of the vessel, bearing all that the human heart holds dear. This

might seem to apply only to those who are situated rather unfortunately in life. Let us not forget that the submerged will not always remain so. The tide will rise and will often bear upon its proudest crest some who started under the most unfavorable circumstance. The flaxen-haired mule-driver of the tow-path may yet direct the energies of a great nation, and quiet the howling, surging, broken-hearted mob by crying clouds and darkness are round about Him, righteousness and judgment are the habitation of His throne. When the church shall give to all the poor of the land the opportunity to develop all that is within them, and to be ready to drift out on the tide and set sail at its height, it will never be forgotten. The accumulations of wealth and power, which will come afterwards, will flow into the lap of the church. A grateful nation will rise up and call it blessed, since it has fashioned such a leader for such a time, when men's hearts are failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that our coming upon the earth. Even among the higher and more greatly favored people, the church has a mission. The Institutional church would bridge the chasm which grows with an increasing yawn between the different classes of men. It would furnish a sphere of activity when the wasted energies of the rich could be displayed. Here it could be demonstrated that the rich and the poor could sit down together; and the Lord would prove to be the maker of them all. Ideal institutionalism will never be reached by the rich laying their gifts at the feet of the church to be expended in some new form of Christian activity. Life far more than money is needed. Men and women must give themselves. The church, composed of rich and poor, must touch this whole fevered sphere of life and bring to it a calmness that comes from soul touching soul. The Institutional church will, however, be more felt upon the line of missionary activity. "It relates," says one authority, "to that form of city mission work which adds certain appliances to the ordinary functions of the local church, that adapt the church work better to the youth of the neighborhood and the families of workingmen. The building is an every-day house; the work is social and educational, and

helpful to the poor; it is diverting, amusing, as well as keenly evangelistic. Its evening services are so manipulated as to reach the classes to which the church ministers. It is a church to which the versatility of the pastor and his associates, and their knack at catching the crowd, count for more than in staid family churches, where good preaching, systematic edification and certain routine pastoral activities are most in demand."*

In the last decade or two, there has been felt by those interested in the spread of education that the great universities must make themselves felt beyond their storied walls. University extension has been the watchword. Lectures and reading courses have been established, and the brightest intellects of the century have lent their great influence and learning to widen the influence of the universities. Schools have been established keeping in mind the wants of a lower class of men and women, who by the exigencies of life have been unable to satisfy their thirst from the Pierian spring. Then again, when a university has been established in a great city, the professors are among the promoters of every good cause which looks towards the improvement of social and civil life. The doors of the lecture rooms are opened, and sociological theories are tested by being made to meet the unbending facts of everyday struggles. Educated men feel themselves responsible for more than professional duties. There is such a thing as university institutionalism. It is the adaptation of university methods and ideals, so as to influence men in a practical reformation and reconstruction of society.

In a like manner the church must cease its professionalism. A Sunday service where an easy going gospel is enjoyed, and a well paid choir praises God by proxy, will never meet the requirements of common sense, much less the demands of Him who went about doing good. The Roman Catholic church is always open. Its confessional, which is after all the center of its worship, to which its sin-stricken adherents fly is well nigh always ready to receive the penitent suppliant. The Protestant church is afar off from the centers of business competition and social struggle for suprem-

* *Triumphs of the Cross*, p. 540.

acy. It is out of touch with the anxious and overburdened souls which are being doled out from between the upper and nether millstone of temptation and sin. Men are feeling that a closed church, when they are struggling in the swell of the world's life, has no significance for them. "Religion is for them too much of a remote past, or of a heavenly future, not a reality for the present and for this world." * There is great fear in some quarters that institutionalism in the church will secularize it to such an extent, as finally to lose its hold on the reverence and respect of those who are to be won from the world and kept till ready to receive the crown. Recreation, social enjoyments and education are essentials in modern life. Men will and must have them. To find these things in the theatre, in the dance hall, and in a school under the influence of extra ecclesiastical endowments, will finally draw men away from the church. No one would imagine that any of these things under the restraints which the church could impose upon them, would hinder the full development of a royal character. If the church could convince men that these things were in full accord with the religion of Jesus Christ, it would not be at all difficult to convince them that the religion of Jesus Christ was the crown and glory of the highest manhood. "If recreation is a normal need of human beings, and if the church finds thousands of its neighbors going down to ruin before its eyes because there is no recreation within their reach that is not full of deadly poison, the instinct of Christian love would prompt the church to supply this nominal need." †

The idea of the kingdom, which we owe to the Ritschlian theology, rests upon the idea that this is God's world. The coming of the Incarnate Redeemer meant the sanctification of the whole life. The whole spirit, and soul, and body, is to be sanctified unto God. We are not at all surprised that religion inspired the great oratorios, the great poems and the great cathedrals. Why should it not also sanctify even the commonest avocations of life. If there be recreations and studies that are hindrances

* Stuckenburg, *the Age and the Church*, p. 184.

† Gladden's *Christian Pastor*, p. 408.

to the attainment of ideal manhood and womanhood, then they are not from above. But even those things that are from above may become a savor of death unto death, unless the divine life of Jesus Christ quickens them. The church must be in such touch with men that they can lean hard upon it when the burdens grow heavy, and the way out of the struggle seems uncertain and dreary. When the honest toiler feels that the church is giving to his child advantages that place him more favorably for a successful struggle in life than he himself could give him, it will not be hard to make him feel that the same influence reaches him with its message of penitence and hope. He will have no reason to say that the poor are neglected in the blessed ministries of the church. He will realize that her friendly shelter is wide enough to reach out over every activity, and to protect from the scorching temptations all those who bask beneath its friendly folds. The testimony of one who has come and seen and conquered is far more than a bushel of theories. The pastor of an influential institutional church in Jersey City says, "Throughout our entire institution the current makes strongly towards the cross, and above all else we place the regeneration of the individual by the power of God. This genial broad gauge common sense religion is very attractive to young people; and if the Master were here a day we believe He would be in the van of the present forward movement of His church." * Another who has had wide experience in institutional work says, "The true value of such a work lies not in the material, or even in the spiritual help which may have been given to a few individuals; it lies rather in that indefinite yet potent influence which like a subtle fragrance pervades the surrounding community, and counteracts the malaria of scorn and doubt which threatens the religious life of our times." †

Where the Institutional church has had a trial it has proven that, instead of being secularized, it has sanctified to a degree the whole atmosphere of the city. It has gotten to itself a name

* Rev. J. L. Soudder, in the *Triumphs of the Cross*, p. 522, 523.

† Rev. C. A. Dickerson, in *Andover Review*, Vol. 12, p. 370.

and it has lived. It has been a light that gives light to all around it, and lifts the whole community nearer to life in God through Jesus Christ.

It might seem that institutionalism is so cityfied that it could have no attractions for the plainer life of country towns, much less for villages. It is possible that the need is not so imperative where the distinctions between the different classes is not definitely drawn. But to a certain degree the need here is no less imperative. The same needs are ingrained in the men, women and children as these we have found among those who are in the stress and competition of the city. The form that the activity should take should be somewhat modified, so as to be in harmony with the environment. Think of the village church with its sward, school house and lecture hall all aglow with festive religion during the long winter months. Think how the church would be a center that would charge the whole atmosphere with a glow akin to heaven. The church would be so closely identified with the whole life of the village that there would be no room for saloon or gambling room. There would be no unbridgable cleavage between the secular and the sacred. Religion would be made a recreation and recreation, education and civic life would be transformed. If the virtue of the religion which we profess could not stand such a trial, it is not possessed with that abiding promised by the coming of the Holy Ghost. It is not of that same kind which threw itself into the very heart of the corruption and lawlessness of the old Roman empire and conquered. It needs a new quickening from above, or it will never be permitted to herald the rising of the millennial sun, which will know no setting. It is but a pale reflection of the might and majesty of Him who said; All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth, go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things that I command you, and lo! I am with you alway—even unto the end of the world, "Now is the moment when the natural, secular and historic forces of Christendom are drawn up in battle array, flushed with their

preliminary success, only awaiting the leadership of the Christian church to march as a united body, conquering and to conquer, sure to win the world for Christ. But if we do not lead these forces we shall lose them. If they do not serve us they will desert and undo us. Our leadership lacking, they will be ranged on the side of heathendom and our conquest of the world will be indefinitely delayed."* The Established Church of England has found it compatible with liturgical service and catechetical instruction to encourage the formation of institutional churches. The success that has attended these efforts shows that it may be adapted to the church under different forms. Methodist, Presbyterian and Episcopal churches have tried it and have found that it is not wanting. The sanctified common sense of Yankee grit in our own country has conquered all opposition and proved beyond a doubt that an Institutional church should have a large share in solving the problem of reaching and holding the great mass of men and women who have turned away from the regularly established services of the sanctuary.

* *Modern Missions in the East*, Lawrence, p. 328.

VI.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS.

BY REV. THOMAS W. DICKERT, A.M.

The Christian Church has always taken an interest in education. Her Lord and Master seeks the education and salvation of the whole man : body, soul and spirit. He said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." This is the highest knowledge to which it is possible to attain. If the chief aim of all education is the realization of ideal manhood, as we believe it is, and implies a knowledge and love of God, as we believe it must, then we do not see how an education in the highest and best sense of the term can be attained independently of the Church, or at least apart from her Lord and Master. Although His immediate disciples were not highly educated in the sense in which that term is now understood, yet they were the bearers and transmitters of that knowledge which is the heart and life of all true education.

The Church gradually gained a fuller consciousness of her great mission, and came to feel that upon her devolved largely the duty to provide for universal education. Paul and Apollos combined religion and learning. It was largely due to the efforts of the former that the Church so early spread over a wide extent of territory, and soon influenced the classic learning of Greece and Rome, drawing their scholars to the feet of Christ and sanctifying their knowledge for a nobler use.

During the Dark Ages learning was almost exclusively confined to the clergy, who were its guardians, until it flashed forth in the Renaissance and the Reformation and began its ceaseless progress through the centuries, enlightening and transforming them, and giving them an effulgence which otherwise they never could have possessed. The Venerable Bede is called "the father of English learning." The great universities of Paris, Bologna,

Oxford, Prague, and others, grew up under the patronage of the Church.

The Reformers opened the way for popular education. They appreciated the importance of general education and maintained that intelligence and learning are the bulwarks of sound religion. It was through their influence that the seeds were sown from which our modern institutions of learning and plans of education have sprung. John Calvin placed general education and catechetical instruction at the basis of the Geneva republic, so that Mr. Bancroft calls him "the father of popular education, the inventor of the system of free schools." The Reformed Church, partaking of the spirit and sharing the principles of the Reformation, has always advocated sound ministerial learning and popular education.

We are therefore prepared to say that the Church has much to do with the solution of educational problems. We should like to know what the present status of education in the civilized world would be, or what the degree of civilization itself would be, if the Church had not concerned herself about man's physical, intellectual and moral development, if she had not prayed earnestly and labored faithfully to bring about the grand results which have been achieved.

Inasmuch as the Church concerns herself with the development and education of the whole man through his whole life, we will begin at the bottom and follow up this great subject as it applies to the unfolding of life and character.

If infancy and childhood are of as great significance in the life of the individual as we believe them to be, they need our careful attention. A renowned Catholic is reported to have said: "Give me a child until it is seven years old, and I care not where it will go afterward," meaning thereby that during those seven years he would so inculcate upon the child the principles of his religion that they would make a lasting and indelible impression upon it. This may be a somewhat extravagant boast, yet during the first seven years of a child's life seeds are sown which will bear their fruitage in after life, both in time and in eternity.

During the tender years of infancy the child is, or if possible ought to be, under the direct care of the mother, for no one can properly take her place in the child's life. If she is a mother in the true sense of that scared name, and above all things a *Christian mother*, she will properly mold these impressionable years and will give the right trend to the little soul that has begun its journey to eternity. Here is where the Church is and ought to be supremely interested. She should not only admire, but also love and cherish the little bud that is soon to blossom into beauty. If she has done her duty toward the mother, and if the mother has responded to the overtures of the Church and has consecrated herself to the Master, the little babe is born not only into the bosom of the family but also of the Church, of which the baptism of the child in the name of the triune God is the authoritative declaration. As Jesus took up the little ones in His arms and blessed them, so the Church takes them up in His name and as members of His kingdom and blesses them, but she gives them back to the parents that they may "nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord."

Do not say that the church has no interest in the education of a child, or in the problems which pertain to its education. In fact, it is she who performs the first significant act that starts many a child on its great journey of education as it is she who performs the last solemn act over the uninhabited house of clay and declares that the fair tenant has been promoted to higher realms where his education will be completed. The great problem for the Church to solve is how she may reach the child of the mother who is not a Christian; how she may sow some good seed that shall bring forth fruit different from that of the parent stem. This is no easy question, and we do not know that it has yet been satisfactorily answered. If properly approached many a mother may be reached through her child, and thus the child may become the means not only of its own salvation and blessing but of the parents' salvation as well.

It is fortunate that the Sunday-school takes hold of the little ones at a tender age and seeks to influence them for good from

the very beginning. Such was not always the case, however, but since the gradual introduction of the primary department, the kindergarten and the cradle roll in the modern graded Sunday-school no infant is excluded, and where the members of the Sunday-school, who are either confirmed or baptized members of the Church, are true to their calling, there will not be a home in any community whose little ones do not feel the influence of the Church as she puts her sheltering arm around them to show them the love of the Master. And it will be readily seen that no home and no parents whose little ones are thus loved and appreciated can long remain the same, but must become better by being brought into touch with the body and the spirit of Christ. The church has already gone a great way toward solving the question of the Christian training of little children, and pastors should be very ready to take advantage of these helps which open many a home that would otherwise be inaccessible to them.

The influence of the Sunday-school is, however, not confined to the little ones, but also plays an important part in the education of the youth, and even manhood and old age. The great problem which confronts the Church in this respect is, how she may bring about the best and most permanent results for those under her influence and care. Are the methods now in most general use the best that can be devised to accomplish the work for which the Sunday-school stands? What is the work the Sunday-school ought to do? What is her peculiar function? We answer, to give her members a Christian training; to familiarize them with the great truths and principles of Christianity; to impress upon them the word of God as found in the Holy Scriptures; to give them an incentive and motive for better and nobler living; to set before them the perfect ideal of manhood as found in Christ Jesus; to cultivate in them the Christian virtues; and to help them develop a Christ-like character. Surely, these are lofty requirements, worthy of and demanding the best effort of all those who are engaged in this kind of work. But is the modern Sunday-school achieving these results? She has certainly done a great deal of good, though

not by any means what she ought or can do. Perhaps a good deal of the blame for her shortcomings may be justly placed upon such pastors as are indifferent to this important part of their work. The pastor is the shepherd of the whole flock, of the lambs as well as of the sheep, and if he will do his duty in this respect he may be able to prevent the complaint which is sometimes made against the Sunday-school: that she educates the young away from the church.

Another question which naturally arises in this connection and which has an important bearing on the subject of education, has by no means yet been finally and satisfactorily settled. It relates to the subject-matter taught in the Sunday-school. Is the International lesson system, now in very general use, the most satisfactory? Is the Blaklee system of graded lessons preferable? Should the Bible be studied promiscuously or consecutively? To answer all these questions would unduly lengthen this paper, since a great deal might be said for and against either system. We are inclined to think that more permanent results would be reached, and that there would be a better knowledge of the Bible among Sunday-school scholars, if the Bible were studied consecutively in graded lessons than by any other system yet used. The perfect system, however, is yet a desideratum. Lesson quarterlies are no doubt very helpful in the preparation of the Sunday-school lesson, but they are not an absolute necessity in the hands of every pupil in the Sunday-school, and may become harmful if they take the place of the Bible in the Sunday-school class, as they have done and are doing in numerous instances. The teacher should be best able to formulate the questions for her class, legitimately using all the helps at hand, and every scholar should have a Bible, which ought to become more interesting, better known, and dearer with every passing Sunday.

The Sunday-school library, if carefully chosen and well equipped, can also be made a very important factor in the Christian education of the youth, and the Church should not disregard its usefulness as an adjunct to her important work.

After all that may be said for the Sunday-school, the Church

should deeply impress parents with the fact that the Sunday-school cannot relieve them of their responsibility to their children, and that the best and most lasting influences must come from the home.

One might think that the public schools were entirely beyond the concern of the Church, but such is not the case. Although the Church has no direct authority over the public school, yet she has always had a vital interest in it. We are told that the free public school system is an adaptation of the Sunday-school idea to the general education of children. It is the duty of the State to maintain schools to which the children of all her citizens may have free access. Without doing violence to the idea of true freedom we may even say that an elementary education should be made compulsory. But what the Church is most concerned about is, how large a place religion may take in the public schools of our land. The letter and spirit of our republican institutions of government are against the sectarian use of public funds. The public school may not be sectarian on the one hand; neither, on the other hand, must it be disrespectful to the Christian religion. There is still some difference of opinion as to the wisdom of retaining a simple form of religious service at the opening of the school when there is any expressed objection to it. Some secret societies in our country, especially such as are strongly anti-Catholic, maintain that this right must not be yielded. Many Christians seem favorable to the omission of prayer and reading of Scripture from the exercises of the public school, maintaining that the perfunctory performance of these solemn acts on the part of at least some teachers results in more harm than good. Such brief periodic reading of Scripture and offering of prayer is not likely to make a deep impression upon those who do not receive any religious training at home, and to those who come from Christian homes the loss will not be great if this indifferent performance of religious acts be omitted from the school exercises. What is far more important, and here is where the Church should exert a salutary influence, is so to mold public opinion that *Christian* teachers may be elected to take charge of the schools.

The personal influence of a Christian teacher is of far more value to the moral character of the children under her care than any number of so-called religious exercises if the heart is not in them. We see no wrong in leaving the matter of religious services in schools at the option of the teachers, who may be in the best position to judge of their value.

The parochial school question is also one of the problems which directly concern the Church. Ten years ago the Rt. Rev. Bishop Keane, Rector of the Catholic University at Washington, D. C., delivered lectures in a number of American cities, in which lectures he set forth the following propositions: That every denomination educate its own children in separate schools at the expense of the State, "the churches to attend to the religious training of the children in the schools *without any additional expense*"; the State "to have control so far as the secular education, or all that concerns civil rights is concerned." This would involve the total extinction of the present public school system, and the division of the taxes *pro rata* among the Churches. An intelligent Catholic layman took up the question and published an open letter in reply to Bishop Keane, which should convince any one, whether Catholic or Protestant, that the parochial system of schools is not adapted to free America, however successful it may be in other countries. This writer tells us that the system, as presented by the Catholic church in spite of the protest of her laity, has brought many temporal evils upon the Catholics in America in isolating them from the rest of the community, and hindering them in labor, business, politics, and friendship, at the same time laying upon them taxes that are burdensome. The common school system as at present in vogue among us is the only system of education that is in harmony with the genius of the civilization of this age and country. The assimilation of the heterogeneous mass of humanity as found in our country can never be accomplished if the inhabitants are divided into castes and sects, and the public school system is one of the most powerful factors to bring about this desirable result of closer union. The Church-school scheme is the very thing which tends to destroy the homogeneity of the American

people. Let the Church remain within her sphere and carry on the work which distinctively belongs to her and she will have plenty to do.

Catechetical instruction has always held an important place in our system of educational religion. This is not so much a problem for our Church as it is for many others, and we notice that there seems to be a more general tendency than ever before on the part of the revivalistic denominations to introduce some system of instruction for the young similar to our catechetical system. The specific problems which confront us on this subject seem to be: How early should we confirm our catechumens? and, How can we get our confirmed members to continue studying the catechism? Some think it is best to confirm catechumens while still quite young, before they have tasted of the pleasures of the world, and before they have set their affections on earthly things. Others maintain that they should be older and more mature before being confirmed, so that they might the better understand the significance of the solemn step. Here, as in many other things, *Mittel Maas ist die beste Strass*, and the question should be left to the discretion of parents and pastor coöperating with the catechumen himself. But how to keep our confirmed members in constant touch with the catechism and its teaching is a more difficult problem. Perhaps we pastors could do a great deal toward gaining this desirable end by taking up for discussion some of the great questions of the catechism, which continue to be the great questions of theological research, and presenting them in the light of modern thought. Catechetical instruction is without a doubt one of the great educational factors in our Christian life, yet its importance and value will depend largely on the catechist. This is the golden opportunity for the earnest pastor to exert a deep and lasting influence upon his young people.

The Church has always manifested a deep interest in the higher education of her members. For this purpose academies, colleges, seminaries and universities have been established and are supported by the Church. We know that the schools and colleges of

New England, which have been its glory, were in the earlier periods established and maintained under a religious impulse. Harvard, which was founded as early as 1636, was dedicated to God and His Church. The Reformed and other churches in the Middle Colonies were only less progressive in the establishment of higher institutions of learning because their settlements were so widely scattered and composed of such various nationalities. Many of the leading institutions of our country were organized by churches or religious bodies, and there would be far fewer colleges and universities in our land to-day, if the Church had not thus early fostered the higher education of her members. On the other hand, we are told that these institutions have manifested their greatest vitality, force and continuing power, have wielded their widest influence, and have achieved their greatest renown when standing in connection with the Church of Christ. Some one has said that the Church has never been at her best except when having colleges under her care and the college has never been at its best except when under the care of the Church.

Our Church has always felt the importance of having an educated ministry. This was the first impulse which led to the establishment of the denominational college. A number of problems arise in this connection and not all of them have yet been solved. We might raise the question: Is there something for which the denominational college is pledged and responsible which no other institution can so well supply? In reply, let us quote the words of one of our own professors at Lancaster as they appeared in the *REVIEW* about five years ago: "In it alone of our higher institutions is the formation of character carried forward to maturity under the joint influence of intellectual and positive moral or religious training. Whether for young men or young women, these colleges are pledged to the maintenance of traditional views of morality through the most solemn of all pledges, and that is the religious foundation on which they rest. There never has been any sure sanction for morality but religion. * * *. Now if the men who are to mold the future, and to carry the problems of the present nearer to their final issue,

are to have an equipment sufficient for their task, both intellectual and moral, I know of no place where it can be had except in the denominational college as supplementary to family life. Here character is formed under the best possible combination of influences, and so far developed and strengthened that there is good reason to believe the young graduate will raise whatever problems he may deal with in life to a higher level than that of material existence, and so be able to appreciate and interpret aright the anxious and even pathetic longings for a larger life which are so vaguely, but so surely and so strongly, at work in the masses of the people at the present time."

Since the denominational college holds so high a place among the institutions of learning in our country, and since she has such a distinctive work to perform, she should be made the best college which it is within the power of the Church to make her. Every loyal minister should do all he can for the institutions of the Church. He should influence his wealthy members to contribute liberally to their equipment and endowment. He should see to it that all the young men of his congregation who desire to pursue a course of higher education be sent to the Church college. The denominational college should be enabled to offer her students as excellent a course of study as any undenominational college in the land, giving them in addition a Christian training such as cannot be had elsewhere.

There are dangers confronting the modern college, which also affect the denominational college. Among them is the danger to make it either a mere high school on the one hand, or a university on the other. It would thus lose the unique and important position it has hitherto held and should continue to hold. We are living in a practical age, and in an age of rapid development. Not only do Americans wish to travel rapidly, and to become rich in a very short time, but they wished to be educated as early as possible. They are rapidly pushed from school to school, and even demand that the college must shorten her course so that a diploma may be received in a shorter time. An effort is being made to crowd the work of four years into three, or else to intro-

duce technical or professional studies into the college course at the expense of scholarship, discipline and culture. This is one of the great problems confronting the denominational college of to-day. To compete with other colleges she is almost forced to yield to these demands, yet if she would continue to be a mighty power for good, the bearer of the standard of true education, she must tenaciously and persistently hold to her unique position, however awakening to the demands made upon her by the progress of the times and employing improved methods of work.

We, as a Church, have done much for our young men. We have established and endowed academies, colleges, seminaries and universities for them. We must, however, not neglect the young women of the Church. It is high time that the Church awaken to a realization of the importance of providing the best possible schools and colleges for her young women, where they may prosecute their higher studies to better advantage and purpose. The Church has several institutions of this kind, which were hitherto somewhat neglected, but are happily now receiving more recognition and support. These colleges for women can be made everything that is to be desired, provided the ministry and laity of the Church take the proper interest in them and provide for them the necessary endowment and a larger number of students. Here, as in the case of colleges for men, the minister has a great responsibility, and he should make every effort to send the young women of the Church to her own institutions. We are glad to observe a healthful awakening along this line, which promises brighter things for the future. Why do not the wealthier women of the Church provide more liberally for their younger sisters by giving donations and endowments to their colleges? Here is a neglected field where much good may be done, and the need is urgent.

Our Theological Seminaries should also be made everything that is desirable, or, at least, needful. We do not approve of young men taking a part or the whole of their theological training outside of the institutions of the Church in which they expect to labor, and this tendency should be disparaged by pastors who have any influence in directing the course of the young men under their

care. It is very evident that such a young man cannot be fully in harmony with the life and thought of his Church. He should first master the best thought of his own Church, and afterward he may seek the truth wherever it is to be found. It is far better to thoroughly master some one distinctive system of thought than to dabble in a number of systems, however excellent they may be.

The Reformed Church lays a great deal of stress on the sermon. The exposition of God's Word occupies a central and conspicuous place in our Church service. Inasmuch as "the excellency of all knowledge, the consummation of all education, the highest reach of wisdom, is to find God in Christ," the sermon plays an important part in the true education of our members. To know Christ, and through Him the Father, is the highest achievement of an education, whatever materialists and agnostics may say to the contrary. We, as ministers of Jesus Christ, have a high and responsible calling, and we can do much to mold the life and character of our people. When we are the most faithful students at the feet of Jesus, then are we the most powerful preachers of His Word. The Bible, the Hymn Book, the Catechism, and the Order of Worship, in the hands of a true servant of Christ, who is in the highest sense both a prophet and a priest, can be made the means of a high order of spiritual culture.

The weekly church paper, the *Reformed Church Review*, and other religious and devotional publications of the Church, as well as many excellent books, now within the reach of everyone, may all be made rich sources of education to those who hunger and thirst for knowledge and righteousness. The earnest pastor will not rest satisfied until he sees a sufficient supply of the best literature of the Church in every home of his parish.

No Church that has the spirit of the Master will be satisfied to educate only her own members, but in response to the command of her Lord she will go and help make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things that He has commanded, comforted with the assurance that He is with her

always, even unto the end of the world. If she has the true prophetic vision of faith she can see on many a shore "from Greenland's icy mountains to India's coral strand," a figure standing with outstretched arms and crying "Come over and help us." Only as she is true to the heavenly vision and shares with others the Bread of Life, will the Church grow in power and wisdom.

Thus we see that the Christian Church stands for the ideal education of the whole man and of all men. This education should be both liberal and Christian, and should result in the best and highest type of Christian manhood and womanhood.

From the cradle the Church takes an interest in our education and the best development of body, soul and spirit. In the tender years of infancy she takes us in her loving arms. In childhood she lays a hand of blessing upon us. In youth she instructs us in the way of life and takes us into her sacred fold. Through manhood and old age she follows us as a tender mother, protects, admonishes, directs, warns, pleads with, comforts, soothes, and saves us. She stands by us as we take leave of the scenes around us and whispers to us of many mansions of glory in the Father's house above. May we all be true to her teaching till we attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

VII.

THE SUPREMACY OF FAITH.

BY PROFESSOR GEO. W. RICHARDS, A.M.

Our age has been called an age of doubt. It is thus contrasted with an age of faith. It must then, also, be an age of transition, for men will not remain in the stage of doubt always. There will be an advance through doubt, either to sounder faith or to confirmed infidelity. Some look upon the tendencies of the present with fear, and lament the days of the fathers, when creeds were unchallenged and faith was undisturbed by the claims of reason. Browning speaks for them in Bishop Blougram's Apology,

"You'll say, once all believed, man, woman, child,
In that dear middle-age these noodles praise.
How you'd exult if I could put you back
Six hundred years, blot out cosmogony,
Geology, ethnology, what not,
(Greek endings, each the little passing bell
That signifies some faith's about to die),
And set you square with Genesis again."

Others, however, hail the decline of faith and the rise of reason as the day of redemption and salvation. They regard faith as a necessary stage in the evolution of the intellectual and moral life of the race. But, when the higher stage of reason is attained, faith is outlived and will pass away. Faith was only the hazy dawn preceding the glorious sunrise of reason. What was once believed, is now known through the discoveries of science or the conclusions of philosophy. What may not be accepted in this way is thrown overboard as myth and superstition.

The former class are the traditionalists. They would gladly return to "that dear middle-age." Cosmogony, geology and ethnology have sounded the death knell to many of their creeds.

They need to be "set square with Genesis again." They are right when they say that the age of faith is gone and the age of doubt has come. The creeds, for some reason or other, are losing their hold on men. The medieval faith cannot maintain itself in this modern age. The latter class are the rationalists. They have forsaken faith and turned to reason. For them faith is another name for superstition. The positive sciences are the hope of the nations. They, too, are right when they emphasize the claims of reason, for reason can no more be suppressed than faith.

Both err in emphasizing one function of the mind to the neglect of the other. Faith may run riot and become superstition; reason may turn tyrant and become rationalism. What we need to-day is a "critique" of faith as a subjective act. What is believing? In what are we to believe? Has not a false demand been made on faith, against which there is a reaction to be followed by a readjustment? Man certainly cannot live by faith alone. He cannot live by reason alone. Both of these functions are necessary for the salvation and the perfection of the race. Yet each must be confined to its divinely ordained sphere. The one must not presume to invade the domain of the other. Scientific or philosophical knowledge should never be made an object of faith. The knowledge that comes by faith alone, should not be made a part of a philosophical system. To believe what can be scientifically known, is an abuse of faith. To attempt a scientific knowledge of the proper objects of faith is an abuse of the reason. We believe that this mistake has been made in the history of the Church; that the present unrest in the faith is due to this error; and that faith will be restored to its supreme place in the lives of men, when its limitations are defined and its true objects are presented in a living way.

In studying the history of the word faith,* *πιστις*, one finds at least four stages of development, in each of which it had a peculiar significance. The word is used by Greek writers, especially

* See Cremer's *Biblico-Theol. Lex. of N. T. Grk.*, Hatch's *Essays in Biblical Greek*, Art. on Faith in Hasting's *Bible Dict.*

by Aristotle, by the writers of the Old and New Testaments, by the Greek fathers, and by the Latin and medieval schoolmen.

In the writings of Aristotle, a representative of philosophical Greek, the word *πίστις* has a threefold meaning—a psychological, a rhetorical and a moral meaning. In its psychological sense it denotes a "conviction" in distinction from an "impression." A conviction has the element of certainty in it; an impression may lack assurance. It is used both of the conviction that comes through the senses and of that which comes through the reason. The conviction may be mediate or immediate. An example of the latter class are first truths, which force their conviction, not mediately through other truths, but immediately of themselves. In its rhetorical sense it denotes that which causes conviction in the mind of the hearer. It is the proof of the case in distinction from the statement of it. In its moral sense it refers to good faith or mutual trust. It is used in this form, "mutual knowledge tends rather to produce mutual *trust*."

In Greek usage the element of "conviction" is constantly emphasized. Faith is a means of knowledge, although a higher knowledge than that given by the senses or the understanding. This appears prominently in Philo, who is a connecting link between its philosophical and biblical use. At times he uses the word in the sense of proof, its rhetorical meaning. But he mainly uses it "in a sense in which the intellectual state of mind, which is called 'conviction,' is blended with the moral state of mind, which is called 'trust.'" It is transferred alike from conviction which results from sensible perception and that which results from reasoning to that which is based on the conception of the nature of God. Philo says: "The mass of men trust their senses or their reason; in a similar way the good man trusts God." These convictions, which come from God, are the highest forms of knowledge. They surpass the impressions of the senses and the conclusions of the reason in certainty. The convictions of faith are, therefore, not vague and indefinite impressions which precede knowledge, but they are the *highest forms of knowledge*.

In both Aristotle and Philo we observe a search for knowledge, not of temporal things only, but of eternal realities. Faith itself is a process by which the mysteries of the heavens may be known. The moral element of "trust" and "self-surrender" is pushed into the background. Philo used the expression "*ἡ πρὸς τὸ ὄν πίστις*." The object of his faith, accordingly, is a philosophical concept, and not God and His promises in their historical and redemptive meaning. He does not seek salvation by faith in a God revealed in history; but he seeks knowledge and interpretation of Divinity.

Coming to the Old Testament, the verb "*πιστεῖω*" includes the element of "acknowledgment, conviction," but it is outweighed by the element of "trust, confidence." The latter is its primary and prominent sense. The significance of the word "to believe" is soteriologic and has salvation for its object and goal. "It is a Messianic conception, in so far as all divine guidance and saving action stand connected with the Messianic salvation and lead thereto." The use of the term differs, accordingly, from the Aristotelian and Philonic usage. In Philo faith is regarded as a means of knowledge, in the Old Testament as a means of salvation. In the former faith rests on an abstract, philosophical concept; in the latter on a concrete historical revelation. In the Old Testament we first find the conditions for the normal exercise of faith. These are the believing person and the person believed in. Man on earth and God revealed from on high are the essential factors of religious faith.

In the New Testament faith as a subjective act is similar to faith in the Old Testament. The apostles recognized an unbroken continuity between the believers of the Old and New Covenants. Paul cites Abraham as a typical believer, Rom. 4, Gal. 3. In Heb. 11, we have a roll-call of the believers of the past, who are to be an example and inspiration to the believers of the present dispensation. Whatever difference there is may be thus expressed: "In the New Testament faith is the trustful acceptance of the grace of salvation, while in the Old Testament it is a trustful expectation of it."

The act of faith is, however, determined by the object upon which it rests. We find, accordingly, development in the faith of the disciples of Jesus. While He is with His disciples in the flesh, they trust in Him and, to a degree, surrender themselves in confidence to Him. Yet their trust and surrender are strengthened as the life of Jesus is unfolded before them. The faith of the Centurion was simple trust in the power of Jesus to heal his child. It was, indeed, only the first degree of faith, yet it was of the right kind. It rested on Jesus. It was the beginning of the faith spoken of in the commission to Paul, who was told to go and open men's eyes that they might receive "*remission of sins and an inheritance among the sanctified by faith in Him.*" Acts 26 : 18. The Centurion's faith was the condition for the healing of his child. The faith in Paul's commission brought *remission of sins* and an *inheritance among the sanctified*. The difference in the subjective act of believing was the difference of believing in Jesus in the flesh and of believing in Christ in glory.

The disciples lived in the presence of Jesus. They were under the influence of His life, expressed in word and deed. In this way faith was generated in their hearts. The Master did not lay before them certain propositions about God and enforce their acceptance by argument. He did not tell them of His divine nature and His human nature, how these were related to each other and to God. He gave no systematic explanation of the origin of the world, of the creation, fall, and redemption of man. These truths would not generate faith. Some day the believer may comprehend these mysteries, but they are the last fruit, and not the beginning, of the life of faith. On the contrary Jesus lived before God, in the sight of men, in the spirit of a son and a brother. He spoke of the Father, of His providence, His love, His grace, His forgiveness. He spoke of men as children of the Father. He spoke of repentance, of faith, of love, of service. These were living realities, not metaphysical formulas which do not fall within the scope of the activity of faith. Under such instruction they began to appreciate the greatness of their Master and could say, "Thou art the Christ." Mk. 8 : 29.

The faith of the disciples was expanded through the resurrection and glorification of Jesus. At first they believed in Him as rabbi; then as Christ; and finally as the Son of God. Rom. 1: 4. In each stage, however, the act of faith was moral rather than intellectual. It constantly rested on a living person, now on earth, then in heaven. It was not conditioned by a theory of His humanity or divinity. The definition of these conceptions came centuries later.

In the epistles of the New Testament faith still has the idea of confidence and trust. Cremer thus distinguishes the difference in the meaning of the word faith, as used by John and by Paul. "In John, who dwells mainly upon the relation of faith to the person of the sent of God, the thought of acknowledgment forms the point of departure whence the further import and the full range of the conception unfold and disclose themselves. With Paul the element of unreserved trust occupies the first place, with the signification 'unreservedly' to give oneself up to the God of our salvation." Yet in both John and Paul that which was acknowledged and believed was a living, historical person, who was exalted on high and through whom God was manifested.

"The New Testament conception of faith includes three main elements, mutually connected and requisite, though according to circumstances, sometimes one and sometimes the other is more prominent. First a fully convinced acknowledgment of the revelation of grace; second, a self-surrendering fellowship; third, a fully assured and unswerving trust in the God of salvation or in Christ." From this summary we observe the transformation of the idea of faith from its classical to its biblical usage. It has lost its intellectual element, which seeks knowledge. It has maintained and developed the moral element of trust and surrender, which seeks salvation. The transformation is due to the influence of the historically revealed God, upon whom faith centers and in whom it finds rest. From the days of the prophets to the days of the apostles, faith was the product of a personal relation between God and man. This relation was

primarily moral, such as exists between friend and friend. There is a striking absence of definitions, dogmas, and metaphysical distinctions.

We come now to the third stage in the development of the idea of faith. "Already in the first century of the Christian era, Christianity passed through two decisive transitions. The first was the transition from Christ to the first generation of believers in Christ, including Paul; the second from the Jewish Christian generation of believers to Gentile Christians. In other words from Christ to the brotherhood of believers in Christ, and from these to the incipient Catholic Church." With these transitions there came a corresponding change in the function of faith. Faith was originally a believing surrender to the person of Jesus Christ. The God, whom Jesus revealed to men, can only be known by men, when their lives are dominated by the realities and principles which ruled the life of Jesus. "A personal life awakens life around it as the fire of one torch kindles another. Early as weakness of faith is in the Church of Christ, it is no earlier than the procedure of making a formulated and ostensibly proved confession the foundation of faith, and therefore demanding, above all, subjection to this confession. Faith assuredly is propagated by the testimony of faith, but dogma is not in itself that testimony." (Harnack's *Dogmatische*, Vol. I., pp. 71, 72, Eng. Transla.) The tendency appears, in the generation following Jesus, of substituting formulas about Christ as an object of faith, in place of the living, historical Christ Himself.

In the second transition, when the Gospel passed from Palestine to Greece, still greater changes followed. It is so tersely and clearly summed up by the author above quoted (p. 72, same volume) that we repeat his language. "They appear (these changes), first, in the belief in holy consecrations, efficacious in themselves, and administered by chosen persons; further, in the conviction, that the relation of the individual to God and Christ is, above all, conditioned on the acceptance of a definite divinely attested law of faith and holy writings; further in the opinion that God has established church arrangements, observance of

which is necessary and meritorious, as well as in the opinion that a visible earthly community is the people of a new Covenant. These assumptions, which formally constitute the essence of Catholicism, have no support in the teaching of Jesus, nay, offend against that teaching."

True faith was weakened in proportion as the traditions of men were substituted for the revelation of God. With the growth of ecclesiasticism the forms, ceremonies, symbols, and officers of the church became the objects of faith. The historic Christ of the Gospel lost His hold upon the consciousness of men. He was not presented to awaken faith; He was not expounded to confirm faith.

This period was closed by the formulation of creeds, which embodied the result of Greek philosophy combined with the Gospel of Jesus Christ. During the second and third centuries there grew up a statement of the faith, which became the *regula fidei* of the Apostolic Church in distinction from the teachings of the heretics. The earliest form of this faith, accepted in Rome and the west, reads as follows: "I believe in God Almighty and in Jesus Christ His Son, our Lord, who was born of a virgin, crucified under Pontius Pilate, the third day rose again from the dead, sitteth on the right hand of the Father, from whence He is coming to judge the living and dead; and in the Holy Spirit." (Hatch's Hibbert Lectures, 1888, p. 318.) Beside the rule of faith, the writings of the Apostles were collected and ranked in authority with the writings of the Old Testament. These books were the voices of the Holy Ghost and took the place of the Apostles, who had passed away. Faith now came to mean *assent*, on the part of the believer, to the statements in the rule of faith and to the writings of the New Testament. It was a return to the Philonic conception of faith. It involved acceptance of certain statements as being true, without requiring a corresponding trust and surrender to Christ Jesus. This assent was a condition for admission into the Catholic Church and became the test by which the true Christian was distinguished from the heretic. The test was that of orthodoxy—right thinking—and

not right living. Yet, properly used, the statements of the creed quoted above would be helpful in the study of Scripture. It contained a summary of the great conceptions which were involved in the notion of God. These might be called faith-knowledge—*glaubenserkentniss*. Yet the young believer or convert could hardly appreciate the significance of even the earliest form of the *regula fidei*. Assent to its truths would necessarily be given in a formal way, without the necessary experience of faith.

The Church, however, went beyond the simple statements of the early creeds. The theologians, who were also Greek philosophers, introduced philosophical concepts into the Christian creed. In the Creed of Origen, about 230 A. D., new statements are found; such as the creation out of nothing, the relation of the Son to the Father before the creation, the manner of incarnation and the relation of the divine and human in Jesus. The great truths of revelation were used as material to build up philosophical systems and to solve the problems which had occupied the great minds of Greece for ages. The theories, which were constructed out of the facts of the Gospel by the assemblies of bishops, who were the guardians and interpreters of tradition, both oral and written, and who were the organs of the Holy Ghost, were made to be as important for the believer as the Gospel itself. The distinction between Christ and Christology was forgotten.

In the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed we have the ripe fruit of a tendency which began in the first century. We need but quote the article concerning Jesus Christ. I believe "in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made," etc. At this point it may be well also to quote a section of the article on Christ in the Chalcedonian Creed: "One and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably," etc. Compare now the Christ of the Gospels, living among His Disciples, and the procla-

mation of the Gospel by the first generation of believers with the propositions in the creeds, and you cannot help but feel that a strange element has entered the life of the Church. Of these statements Mark was ignorant, Matthew knew nothing, and John makes no mention. Yet these men had living faith, resting on a living Christ. They were in contact with a person, and not a philosophy. The life of the early Church is the surest testimony of its faith. Then Christians loved one another and aimed to reproduce the Christ-life in themselves and their community.

It is not our purpose to deny the truth of the statements made in these creeds. Their exposition of the relation of the Son to the Father, and of the divine and human in Christ may be true. We may never get a better statement of these mysteries. But these statements are not objects of faith. It is a mistake for the Church to preach them and to demand of her members assent to propositions which they cannot in the least comprehend. To use them in worship and make them a medium for the confession of our faith is making a demand on the consciousness of the nineteenth century which it has resisted and will resist. Some elect theologians may pass through the philosophical and theological experience, which is necessary for the appreciation of the Chalcedonian Creed, but it is too much to expect that Christians generally will find any force in them. They are simply confounded by them and many intelligent minds are repelled by them.

The last stage in the history of the word faith, as a subjective act, was reached in the middle ages. It finds its objective expression in the form and spirit of the Athanasian Creed. The Nicene Creed was to be appropriated by the individual, not in a moral but in a philosophical way. To the intelligent Greek it might authenticate itself and it might become the basis of his thinking, if not the rule of his life. The Athanasian Creed, according to the latest researches, comes from the eighth century. It was a partial product of the western mind. No other creed went so far in making the Trinity an article of faith as necessary for salvation. It begins thus: "Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith! Which faith except

every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." Then follows a statement of the articles of the faith. Four times over salvation is made to depend on carefully defined belief. The Athanasian Creed in Western Christianity was made a *legal statute* to which obedience must be rendered. It was now a matter of submission to the voice of the Church without even the exercise of the reason. Faith in the faith was required, so that every one without effort would be in possession of a finished theology.

We find, accordingly, in the history of Christianity of the pre-reformation age three forms of faith. First, it was trust and self-surrender to Jesus; second, it was the acceptance of doctrinal statements about Jesus, which required intellectual comprehension; third, it was submission to a legal statute, which demanded obedience. It is, in other words, the transition from an inward, vital religion to an outward, lifeless superstition. Both the demands of faith and reason are disregarded, and men will eventually revolt from that which does violence to the deepest functions of their nature. How utterly the Athanasian Creed is out of harmony with intelligent modern Christianity is illustrated by an experience of Dean Farrar. The Church of England is the only Church in all Christendom which recites this creed in common worship. "It was once my curious fortune," says he, "to stand in church facing a seat on which were seven or eight men of universal fame in art, in literature, in science, in public life. The expression of weariness and dislike upon the face of every one was a lesson to me; for each one of them was not a sceptic, but a Christian and a communicant. All of them felt how utterly unlike was the form assumed by this creed to the general teaching and methods of Holy Scripture. Not one of them doubted, so far as I knew, the doctrine of the Trinity; but they all felt that the harsh, formal and technical dogmatism of the creed added nothing to true faith; while—since so few are capable of grasping its real significance—it tends to minister directly to popular error." This feeling, for some reason or other, is becoming more prevalent and cannot be met by accusa-

tions of apostasy and cries of heresy. Yet the question may be asked, have not the Reformers of the sixteenth century cast off the errors of medievalism and restored faith, in its subjective and objective meaning, to its proper place? Let us see what their position on this question was and how far Protestantism is free from the errors of the ancient Church.

The reformers agreed in protesting against the idea of subjective faith as held by the Roman Church. They restored apostolic faith, in the sense of trust and surrender to Jesus, to its true place in the Christian life. * For Luther, faith meant no longer adherence to a series of doctrines of the Church or to a statement of historical facts. "It was the certainty of the forgiveness of sins, and, therefore, also the personal and continuous surrender to God as the Father of Jesus Christ, which transforms and renews the whole man." He himself defines faith thus: "Here it is to be observed that there are two kinds of believing: First, a believing about God, which means that I believe that what is said about God is true. This faith is rather a form of knowledge or observation than a faith. There is, secondly, a believing in God, which means that I put my trust in Him, give myself up to thinking that I transact with Him, and believe without any doubt that He will be and do to me according to the things said of Him. Such faith, which throws itself on God, whether in life or in death, alone makes a Christian man."

The object of his faith was not a philosophical or a mystical abstraction. It was the God of grace manifested in Christ Jesus. He rose above the religious machinery of his time—ascetic exercises, canon laws, scholastic theology, hierarchy, and sacraments, to find God for himself in the historic Christ. In Him he found the living assurance of the living God, who has revealed Himself in Christ. He believed in God only as He had revealed Himself in Christ and continues to reveal Himself in Christianity. Man cannot believe in God as He is in Himself, apart from His revelation. Such a God belongs to the meta-

* See Harnack's *Hist. of Doc.*, Vol. VII., p. 180 to end of volume. Eng. Transla.

physical speculations of the Aristotelians. He said: "The sophists have so painted Christ, showing that He is Man and God, counting His legs and arms, mixing His two natures in a wonderful way, which after all is only a sophistical knowledge of the Lord Christ. For Christ is not called Christ, because He has two natures. What does that matter to me? But He bears this glorious and comforting name on account of the office and work which He has taken upon Himself, that gives Him His name. That He is by nature Man and God, is something which concerns Him; but that He has filled his office and poured out His love, and has become my Savior and Redeemer, this is for my comfort and my good." A clearer distinction between the historical and the metaphysical Christ could not be made. The two, namely, the revival of Apostolic faith and the Apostolic or historic Christ, had to come together. For living faith can only come through the living Christ.

The same conception of faith is expressed in Answer 21, of the Heidelberg Catechism. It "is not only a certain knowledge whereby I hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in His word." That is the lesser factor of true faith. It is also, "an assured confidence, which the Holy Ghost works by the gospel in my heart." What is the content of this "assured confidence"? To me personally "remission of sin, everlasting righteousness, and salvation, are freely given by God merely of grace, only for the sake of Christ's merits." The gospel is the medium by which the Holy Spirit works faith. God in Christ, the Redeemer and Savior, is the object upon which this faith rests. We may accept the whole Bible as infallible truth, say yea and amen to all its statement, and still have no saving faith. It is the gospel in the Bible, which must lay hold of the heart and work confidence in, and surrender to, the God of Salvation.

While the reformers had a living experience of true faith and found its object in God as revealed in Christ, they accepted without question the old Creeds. For them there was no contradiction between the Christ of Scriptures and the Creeds of the patristic Church. Historians now question whether the Reformer's car-

ried their first principles to their legitimate conclusion. Did they, in other words, complete Protestantism or was there a compromise between the Reformation and Catholicism? Ritschl states the problem thus, "So far as the history of dogma is concerned, the Lutheran reformation would have completed itself otherwise than it ultimately did, if the conclusions that follow from Luther's fundamental thoughts had been established by him in their *entirety* and by a *thorough-going* comparison with the *whole* tradition. The fragments of the old, that remained, restricted even for Luther himself the validity of the new thoughts, and, in the case of those who came later impoverished them." The years from 1519 to 1523 are now generally regarded as the most promising period of the Reformation. But the buds that were then put forth failed to ripen into fruit. The Reformers rejected the abuses in the cultus and the errors in the doctrine of the Church of the Middle Ages, but they accepted without question the old dogmas. The Augsburg Confession agrees with the Roman Church in accepting the decree of the Nicene Synod. It joins in condemnation of heretics, or of those who do not accept this decree. The Smalcaldic Articles, referring to the ancient dogmas, begin, by saying, "regarding these articles there is no controversy between us and our opponents, since we confess them on both sides." After the article on the office and work of Christ, it is stated that "to depart from this article, or to condone or to permit anything against it, is not possible for any of the pious." Harnack says, "Luther would at any moment have defended with fullest conviction the opening words of the Athanasian Creed: "Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith."

With this conception of the object of faith we can easily see how gradually the subjective faith of the reformers would change so as to lose its moral character and become again intellectual assent. Just as the Apostolic age, with its vigorous Christian life was followed by a period of ecclesiasticism and orthodox confessionalism to the detriment of Christian piety, so the Reformation was followed by a period of heartless orthodoxy and lifeless

ecclesiasticism. Speaking about the appearance of Calvin and comparing his generation with that of Luther and Zwingli, A. V. G. Allen says, "when Calvin appeared as a Reformer, the first glow of enthusiasm and zeal which characterized the earlier generation had begun to die away, and in its place had come timidity and distrust, a tendency to compromise truth in the interest of quiet and order." Prominent among these mediators was Melancthon, who yielded point after point to the Romanists for the sake of unity and peace.

A cursory examination of the confessions of the latter half of the sixteenth century, which are an expression of the faith of Protestantism, will reveal the same scholastic tendencies as the Creeds of the fourth and following centuries. The same spirit molds the mind of the Church and there is a reversion to the same conception of faith in its subjective sense. In the *Belgic confession*, composed in 1561, revised and adopted by the Synod of Dort, 1618-1619, the following statements are made (Art. 19) concerning the person of Christ. "We believe that by this conception the person of the Son is inseparably united and connected with the human nature, so that there are not two Sons of God, not two persons, but two natures united in one single person; yet each nature retains its own distinct properties," etc. And this is a part of a confession of faith. The same spirit appears in the *Thirty-Nine Articles* and in the *Westminster Confession*. Yet these are the symbols of a great portion of Protestant Christianity. They are presented as objects for faith and any deviation therefrom throws one open to charges of heresy and unsoundness in the faith.

There is evidently a contradiction between the faith of Protestantism and the creeds of Protestantism. The evangelical faith has not found expression in evangelical creeds. It still rests on the scholastic formulas and metaphysical speculations of a past age. "The reformers gave to the Church the faith in God, Christ and the Holy Ghost, of which Paul made confession in Rom. 8; but they gave to it at the same time the old dogma as the unchangeable cardinal article, together with a Christological doc-

trine, which did not negate the fundamental evangelical interest, but which had received an entirely scholastic shape and had therefore the inevitable effect of confusing and obscuring faith." So speaks Harnack of Luther, and the same may be said generally of the reformers.

From all this it appears that the Protestantism of the sixteenth century, and even that of the nineteenth, is not yet complete. There was a protest against the moral abuses and the cultus of the Church. That was only one phase of the Church's life. The old dogmas were allowed to stand and accepted without question by the reformers. It could not have been otherwise with the historic knowledge they had. They were especially concerned with the questions of righteousness by works and the authority of the Pope. These errors had their roots mainly in medieval scholasticism. They accepted, therefore, without question, the ancient symbols, as being in harmony with the doctrines of the Bible. Now, however, the time has come for another protest on the part of Protestantism. In fact that is one of the original privileges of Protestants, for when they cease to protest they lose their birthright. This privilege alone, given to their descendants, would be worthy of the great reformers of the past, and for it we would not cease to praise them. They began a movement, which may be said to be still in its infancy. We do not honor them by making them infallible and final authorities in matters of faith and doctrine. That is the very thing they protested against. We do not dishonor them when we assert that they have not carried to their logical conclusions the great principles of the Christian life, which they proclaimed. They did not, yea they could not, start from the innermost center of the new view of Christianity and furnish a systematic statement of the whole. They could not then point out what should remain and what should be dropped. It was too big a problem for a single generation, or even a century, to solve. Some questions can only be settled by the travail of many centuries. They must be lived out rather than thought out.

Are we then to cast aside dogmas and creeds? Such a step

would be more erroneous than the continued acceptance of the dogmas we now hold. Every living faith will have its creed. Dogmas are an important product of life. But we want in our creeds that which is for faith. Only that which faith, in the sense of trust and by a life of trust and self surrender, can appropriate, can be a legitimate part of a creed. There is a knowledge, which comes only by faith in distinction from the knowledge gained by the understanding. A man's anatomy, or the laws of his mental activity can never be discerned by faith. That is a sphere for the scientist and the philosopher. A man's goodness, truthfulness, and love can only be known by the communion of faith. God in Christ can only be known by faith. As we surrender ourselves to Jesus, will Jesus reveal God in us. It is of this knowledge that He spoke to Peter, when He said: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father, which is in heaven." Matt. 16:17.

Faith must rest on an historic reality. We cannot believe in a metaphysical statement, however true it is, nor in a mystic dream. God does not ask us to have faith in the baseless fabric of a vision. He has, accordingly, revealed Himself in the history of His people in forms of flesh and blood. This concrete revelation comes to its fullest expression in Jesus Christ. God in Christ is the object of faith. He is as real, as concrete, as the material universe around us, but we can only comprehend him by believing fellowship. This is the bulwark of the Christian religion. It has to do, not with a fiction of the imagination, a conclusion of the understanding, or a desire of the heart, but with an historic person. The historian, as such, will not find God in Him. The philosopher will not see God in Him. God can only be realized by child-like faith. This faith brings with it its own convictions. It needs not the support of science or of philosophy. It is a creation of the divine spirit in the human heart and rests "in demonstration of the spirit and of power."

The Scriptures, which record the historical process in which God revealed Himself to men; in which, also the life of His Son

is contained; and the spiritual experience of the first believers is described, will forever remain the norm of faith. Through the Scriptures we come to Christ and through Christ to God. Since God drew nigh unto men in history, an historical understanding of the Scriptures is necessary. Any other interpretation of the Bible will be unhistoric and therefore not true. Yet when historical study and critical research have restored the Christ of history and have properly related the law and the prophets to the gospels, we have only done preparatory work. We have done all that science can do. The spiritual contents of the historical person are comprehended with another faculty, namely with the heart.

God, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are objects of faith. But we can "trust" in God only as He has revealed Himself outwardly. God in Christ through the Holy Spirit awakens faith, confidence, trust. Thus we experience personally His love, His grace, His providence, His justice, His consolations and promises. All of these belong to the life and to the knowledge of faith. What has faith to do with the statement made in the Chalcedonian Creed "that Christ is consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the manhood." Further, that He is "one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten to be acknowledged in two natures, inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably." Are we not burdening creeds with metaphysical distinctions which are altogether foreign to faith, yea even contradict the very laws of faith. These statements a Greek philosopher, without the least trust in Jesus, might interpret; but a humble believer can never intelligently accept them as a part of his *justifying* faith.

Is not the mind of the Church to-day vaguely feeling that there is a gap between its creeds and its faith? There is a universal unrest which is often interpreted as a sign of apostacy and infidelity. Is it not rather the reaction against the unnatural union of evangelical faith with Catholic dogma? Men demand new creeds. Some want to put away all creeds. Others seek a revision of creeds. It is a mistake to suppose that men want to stop believing, but they will stop believing what can not by nature

be believed. It is the solemn duty of the Church to provide a creed which will embrace articles for faith and faith only. Otherwise men in their confusion will forsake the Church, or they will blindly and superstitiously hold on to her as their last resort. It is not now a time for heresy trials, for silencing men by the weight of authority, and for simply offering an obstinate opposition to the modern spirit. We need an intelligent study of history, a sympathetic appreciation of the sincerity of men, and a creed which is a proper object of faith.

It is not a question of a revision of creeds, or of a long creed, or of a short creed, but of a true creed. It may be long, it may be short, but it must be true. It must, furthermore, be an expression of the faith-knowledge of our age, and not a series of philosophical statements about God, man and the world of a by-gone age. It must be a faith that comes through Jesus Christ and not through Aristotle or Hegel. Such a faith will at once authenticate itself to the unlearned as well as to the most scholarly Christian. It will set at rest the long-continued conflict between faith and reason. It will be the only means of uniting the different sections of Christendom.

This question has, also, a practical bearing, so far as the preaching of our times is concerned. The average sermon consists of a *theory* of Christ, of the atonement, of conversion, of faith, of the Christian life. We are all inclined to preach such sermons. Yet these discourses do not quicken the heart, nor do they generate faith. No preacher will make people believe in Christ by telling them that he was God and man. But he will work faith in their hearts, if he shows them God in Christ and man in Christ. Then they will, gradually and in the normal way, perceive his divinity and humanity. To tell an audience in a sermon that they must believe such and such a theory of Christ's person is to drive them from Church and turn them into rationalists. But to hold up Christ before them in a living way is to draw them unto Jesus and feed them with the bread of life. Men cannot *will to believe* without the *motives for faith*. Present Jesus Christ to their faith, and not to their understanding merely,

and they *will* believe. This is probably the secret of a power of a Moody. His theology was defective. But he preached Christ in a concrete way, and he appealed to the believing power in men. He did somewhat like Jesus did on the way to Emmaus, "And beginning from Moses and the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself," Luke 19: 27. Then "they said one to another, was not our heart burning within us, while he spake to us in the way, while he opened to us the Scriptures," v. 32. "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the Gospel of God," Mark 1: 14. He brought something that the Scribes and Pharisees did not have, something that the Greek philosophers had not found. It was not a legal statute nor was it a philosophical system but good news from God to men. Jesus demanded faith in this gospel, saying, "repent ye and believe in the gospel." That was the only thing men could believe in. That is the only thing men are expected to believe in now. The pulpit can only command faith when it proclaims the gospel of God.

It is not our purpose, nor would it be in our power, to define the contents of a satisfactory creed. Protestantism may not yet be prepared to do so. Yet we had reached a stage in its history when we feel the conflict between Protestant faith and its creeds. It is a hopeful sign of a new era of Christian life and activity. Men are not losing faith, the faculty of trust and self-surrender to a personal savior. It is only an age of doubt so far as the old confessions are concerned. Christ is not losing respect and admiration among men, but some of the theories about Christ are passing away. Men seek Jesus consciously or unconsciously. But if they find Him not in the Church, or only a lifeless image of Him there, they will turn elsewhere for the satisfaction of their heart's desires. The reason of men, as applied in the study of the world and of history, will not destroy true faith. The two have distinct missions. That faculty, which finds the mother in the woman, the father in the man, will find God in Christ. Faith will continue through eternity. Though we stand in the presence of God and see Him in His glory, we shall still believe in Him.

Knowledge will never supersede faith, faith will not turn into sight. The very life of the soul, its immortality, its bond of union with God in Christ is faith. We know in part and our knowledge will change. But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three, and the greatest of these is love.

VIII.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

IN WHAT SENSE A NEW CREATION.

Christianity as a peculiar religious and moral order of existence is frequently designated a *new creation*. This designation is based upon certain expressions used in the New Testament. St. Paul says, 2 Cor. 5 : 17, that, "if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature," or *creation*, *καὶ ἡ κτίσις*. And in Gal. 5 : 15, he declares that "neither circumcision is anything, nor uncircumcision, but a *new creation*." In these passages the term manifestly means a moral and spiritual transformation of the soul. It expresses the same thought which is elsewhere expressed by the terms *conversion* and *regeneration*, only emphasizing somewhat more the idea of a divine agency in the process intended. And this Biblical usage was doubtless based upon Jewish precedent. The Rabbins were in the habit of saying that one who had been converted from Judaism to Christianity was a *beriya' chadâshâ*, a *new creation*. Building upon this phraseology the early Greek theologians, with their philosophical and rhetorical tendencies, were in the habit of distinguishing a *threefold creation*. The *first* creation was defined as "the transition from non-existence to existence"—creation in the proper sense; the *second* or *new* creation, as "the change from a worse to a better form of existence"; the *third*, as the creation of "the new heavens and the new earth," foretold in such passages of Scripture as Isa. 65 : 17, and 66 : 22, and 2 Pet. 3 : 13. See Cremer's *Biblico-Theological Lexicon*, p. 381. The use of such language was not meant to convey the idea of the creation of something absolutely new, but merely the idea of the complete though progressive realization, through a moral process, of the principle involved in the creation from the beginning. Thus Basil, the Great, explains the statement in Ps. 104 : 30, "thou sendest forth thy spirit,

they are created," by saying that "by creation is meant the change to a better condition of those who in this life have fallen into sin, the renewal which takes place in this life, and the transmutation from our earthly to the heavenly conversation," *De Spiritu*, cap. xix. The use of the term *creation* in this sense doubtless implies that the moral process of transformation in the human soul, with the ultimate effect which it was expected to produce in the natural world, comes to pass through the exercise of a divine agency; but as to the nature and extent of this agency the mere use of the term *creation* does not justify us in drawing any conclusions.

It is customary to associate with the word *creation* the idea of a production of something out of nothing—the idea of absolute origination. The notion of a *new creation*, accordingly, would imply the idea of a new order of existence, not coming out of the old, but raised up and joined on to the world already existing. And this is the sense in which the word is often taken. The new creation, then, is a spiritual or supernatural order added to the natural—a *donum supernaturale*, standing by the side of the natural, but never coming into real organic union with it. Such union would be impossible because of the heterogeneity of origin and nature. Such new creation may be supposed to have been rendered necessary by the catastrophe of the fall; or it may be supposed to be needed in consequence of an essential incompleteness of what is called the natural creation. Most generally it is the fall that is supposed to have occasioned the necessity of a new creation, in order to make good the ruin that has been wrought in the old. Man is supposed to have been originally created in a state of moral as well as physical perfection. In the language of the Westminster Confession, man in his origin was "endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness." But he fell from this good estate, and "became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties of soul and body." The spiritual nature with all its capacities and powers, which, however, according to some was from the beginning a mere *donum supernaturale*, was lost, and this loss of the spiritual in man affected even the con-

stitution of the natural world, which now began to be afflicted with painful disorders and perverse tendencies. This is the teaching of John Milton in "Paradise Lost." Now in order to deliverance from the evil of sin, and in order to bring man and the world back to the condition in which they originally existed, a new creation is required ; which, however, can only be brought to pass with infinite difficulty and pains, while the original creation was sprung into being with infinite ease. A new creative principle is introduced, a new spiritual order gradually established in the world, which is never of the world, but which is supposed to reach down into it, taking hold of some of its perverted elements, that is, human souls, and building them up into a new spiritual kingdom or world.

Now such a new creation Christianity has been supposed to be. It is regarded as a supernatural, that is, miraculously constituted, order over against what is supposed to be the merely natural order of the actual world both in its physical and moral aspects. It is miraculous in its origin. It comes into the world, not through its own constitution, but from some sphere outside of it. It is an irruption, a breaking into, the order of the natural world, setting aside its laws, and producing results independently of its energies. This is supposed to be the character in particular of Christ, who is rightly taken to be the measure of Christianity. His appearance in the world is regarded as a mere *advent*. He came not through the order of human life ; in spite of the ages of preparation for His coming, which constituted the history of Israel, His appearance was not vitally conditioned by the order of nature. His birth was a physical miracle. And though He constantly called Himself the *Son of Man*, He was in fact no son of *man* at all. Though said to have been "born of the seed of David according to the flesh," He was not conceived of any human seed. His person was divine, and divine only. His human nature was anhypostatic. Though He had assumed human nature, yet He wore it rather as a garment temporarily thrown over His divinity, than as an essential part of His own being. He was a being always hovering above the world, never coming

really into the order of its life ; and this same sort of supernatural character now belongs to the Church, which is the continuation in the world of Christ's life. Christ came to accomplish a certain work, legal and forensic in its character ; and when that was accomplished, He went away into heaven, and the Holy Spirit came and took His place in the world, continuing His work, and through supernatural channels setting over into elect souls something of the life of Christ. In this operation the Church originates. It is a supernatural constitution, continuing itself in an order of existence, by tactual, sacramental succession, that has nothing in common with the universal life of the world, and is not subject to its laws. Hence Church history is in no sense a history of real development and change, for here everything is finished and fixed from the beginning. The organs of the Church are the members of an official priesthood perpetuated by the imposition of episcopal hands, by means of which the life of Christ is communicated to them. And the means by which they dispense this life are institutions whose effects are produced *ex opere operato*. Thus the regeneration of a human soul is the result of a miraculous operation, through supernatural channels, on the part of an "apostolic priesthood." Or, according to another theory, less consistent and logical, it is the result of an immediate though secret operation of the Holy Spirit. In either case the result is a "spiritual miracle," standing in no true causal relation to the moral and spiritual life of the world.

This mode of apprehending Christianity now encounters insuperable difficulties in the conditions of modern thought. In the first place the "supernatural operation" is often seen to remain without true moral and spiritual effects. And if it be said that this lack of effect is explained by the absence of *faith*, there is an admission of the need of something *subjective*, which is inconsistent with the notion of the objective power of the "order of the new creation." But, in the second place, there is a lack of continuity between Nature and Christianity in this view that stands in direct contradiction to the modern conception of the world. The creation in its entire compass, as it impresses the

thinking mind at the present time, is *one*, as God is one. And this unity of the world is a demonstrable fact. The conception of unity is not an assumption or hypothesis. The theory of evolution upon which that conception rests is, indeed, sometimes said to be still an hypothesis, but only by thinkers who are themselves behind the time. In space the world has been proved to be one; and it has been proved to be one also in time. There is a law of continuity that extends through all space and through all time. From the original fire-mist to the brain of man there is continuity of development, however variable may be the results. There are no breaks in the development of nature. From the mineral to the plant, from the plant to the animal, from the animal to man, and again from man to his institutions and works, there is one unbroken process of orderly development under the impulse of resident forces. And instead of this law of continuity of development being fatal to human freedom, it is the only condition on which that freedom can be maintained; as we have endeavored to show in an article on "Election and Selection," in the April number of this REVIEW for the current year. That there is unbroken continuity in the process of evolution is the teaching of modern science, which is now well nigh universally accepted. There may be differences still in the way in which the evolving forces may be apprehended. Are these forces merely blind energies coming from nowhere, and acting according to no conception or law, or do they proceed from an absolute will acting according to an unchanging purpose or plan? A few thinkers may take the former view; the great majority take the latter. But our main point now is that all thoughtful men at present accept the fact that the world is one, and that one continuous law of development accounts for all its phenomena. And it is gratifying to the theologian, certainly, to know that the great majority of scientific thinkers accept the truth—not as one of scientific discovery, of course, but of rational intuition—that this universe of finite things has its ground in God, whose Reason and Will are the source of its laws and energies. It is God's Will that energizes in the forces resident in the natural world; and His energy

in its mode of operation is determined by the unchanging ideas and purposes of His eternal Reason. This is the doctrine of evolution as it is accepted now by thousands of theologians. If there are some who hold that the doctrine of evolution *ought to be* atheistic, and therefore *must be* atheistic, they may well be disregarded in any effort to show what evolution now is.

But, now, when we come to the consideration of religion, or Christianity, can we set aside the idea of continuity and harmony of development, and suppose that we are here in the sphere of an entirely new creation, in which the laws of the natural creation no longer in any form have validity, or by which these laws are vacated? Is it necessary that we should make such a supposition? Does Christianity itself make such a demand? Does it not rather, by emphasizing the unity and eternity of God, lead us to suppose that one divine idea and one divine purpose embraces the entire universe both in its physical and spiritual aspects? Christianity, we are bound to admit, of course, is something new in relation to the physical and moral world as this stood before its appearance. But is the newness not rather in the *completion* and *perfection* of the idea, than in the idea itself? Is Christianity a departure from the fundamental plan or conception of the world, brought in only because something had got wrong in the working out of that plan? We can not think so; and we are sure that no such notion will now get much credence among thoughtful men. Christianity is something new in the evolution of the world only as the flower is something new in the evolution of the plant. It is not in any sense a *donum supernaturale*, added to the world in an outward, mechanical, and more or less violent way, involving an infraction of the previous law and order of the world. It is the completion and flower rather of all previous stages in the process of the world's development, the realization through immanent forces of the idea in which the world had its beginning. This implies, of course, too, that it is the elimination of all abnormal conditions which may have come into the process of development in consequence of the misuse of freedom on the part of the creature.

Should we be told, now, that this conception makes Christianity "purely naturalistic" and wrongs the idea of the supernatural, we would answer that in our opinion this objection involves a total misapprehension of the character and relation of Nature and the Supernatural. The natural and supernatural are not two separate orders of being. We, indeed, recognize a difference between the two forms of existence. The difference may be compared to that between body and soul. The body is not the soul; and yet the soul is in the body, in its present state at least, and the latter is the expression of the former. What is the Supernatural? It is God, His mind, His will, His energy. What is the essence of the natural? It is the thought and energy of God. God is, indeed, more than nature. He is before and above nature; but He is also in nature and His immanent energy, whether always exerted consciously, or as some think to some extent unconsciously, constitutes the very essence of nature. The supernatural, then, is the immanent ground of the natural; and the natural is the progressive expression of the supernatural according to its own inherent laws. In this *expression* there can be no contradiction, any more than there can be contradiction in the *being* of the supernatural. And yet in the process of the self-expression of the supernatural, or let us say, of God in nature, there appears a great amount of differentiation and variety. The process is one. The idea to be realized at the end is present in the beginning. The energy realizing that idea is at work from the start, only limiting and adjusting itself to the condition of the material in which it may at any time be working. There is no coming into the process anywhere of foreign elements. And yet in the ongoing of the process there appear in successive gradations ever-ascending orders of being, from the mineral to man, from the man who is of the earth to the man who is "out of heaven," ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, and the spiritualized, perfected, humanity which is the result of His appearing. Nor is it necessary to suppose that the process is always and everywhere going forward with uniform rapidity. In physical evolution, we know, this is not the case. Sometimes the process seems to be stationary

for ages. But during such ages of quiescence there is accumulating a fund of energy which bursts forth in apparently new products when the appropriate moment has come. The opening of the flower in spring is a comparatively sudden process, but the energy for it has been preparing for months of apparent quietude. When the fulness of the time has come the flower makes its appearance. And so when the fulness of the time had come, the animal appeared in the advancing evolution of life in nature. And, again, when, after ages of development in the animal world, everything was ready for the manifestation of self-conscious mind, or personality, man appeared upon the scene of the world's life, and the process of evolution was lifted to a new and higher stage in which the intelligence and freedom, slowly and painfully evolved in preceding stages, came to be most prominent factors. Christianity, finally, must be supposed to be related to the world's life in the same way. It too came in "the fulness of time"; and it came in the process of the world's life, which is one. It is, indeed, a new thing in the process of development, and yet not a new creation in the sense of an absolutely new or miraculous beginning. Or if we choose to call it miraculous, we must remember that it involves at least no contradiction of the previous order of development.

This conception, now, we believe to be applicable, in the first place, to the person of Christ Himself. Christ is the head of humanity, the perfection of human nature, and not in any sense its negation or contradiction. It has been said that Jesus must have been physically a new creation, for in no other way is it possible to account for the "moral miracle," the sinlessness which appeared in His life. His personality, accordingly, is a new moral creation. "But if Jesus was a new moral creation," asks W. L. Walker in a work noticed elsewhere in this issue of the REVIEW, "what, then, becomes of the old humanity?" Would He in that case be truly man, rooted really in the life of humanity? And if not, how then could He be the Redeemer of men? The answer to this question used to be that the merits of Christ are set to the account of sinners for their salvation, and that is

all that is necessary, in addition perhaps to some direct influence of the Holy Spirit upon men's souls. Or when this view was felt to be unsatisfactory, it was held that the saving life of Christ is set over into men's souls, either directly through the Holy Spirit, or indirectly through the operation of an official priesthood. In some quarters perhaps this latter theory may be believed still; but that it is losing its hold upon thoughtful men there can be no doubt. It is too mechanical and too magical. It does not bring Christ really into the organic life of men; and a conception of Christianity that does not do this must ever be impotent as a saving element among men. In order that Christianity may again take firm hold upon the mind of the age, we believe that before all things it will be necessary that Christ Himself should be recognized as standing in vital and organic relation to humanity. How otherwise could he bear our sins? And how could we be saved through His life? By a communication thereof through "supernatural channels," it may be said. But there can be no communication of life between two absolutely heterogeneous orders of existence. We believe, therefore, that a right answer to the question, "What think ye of Christ," is one of the fundamental religious needs of our age, and that the subject which we are considering in this article is not by any means one of merely speculative interest.

The doctrine of the miraculous conception of Jesus as apparently represented in the first chapters of the first and third Gospels, is sometimes brought forward as an argument in favor of the old idea of Christianity as a new creation. To enter into anything like a discussion of the literary criticism of these chapters would here be manifestly impossible. Those who are familiar with the literature of the subject are aware of the difficulties with which these chapters are beset. To mention nothing else, there is the fact that while Joseph is represented as having had nothing to do with the conception of Jesus, yet the genealogies connected with this representation both profess to give the descent of Joseph and not of Mary. To resolve this difficulty by resort to a *legal fiction*, after the manner of the older exegesis, will no longer satisfy.

We here express no opinion as to the correct exegesis of these difficult chapters. But it is no secret that there is an increasing number of pious and able theologians, who, while they sincerely believe in "the conception by the Holy Ghost," do not believe that this binds them to hold that that conception took place without paternity. A *literal* construction of the language of these chapters would doubtless lead to the notion that the conception was the result of a miraculously creative act, without human paternity. Of course such a conception would remove Jesus out of the order of the common life of humanity. He would be the beginning of a new humanity by the side of the old—a *deutero-Adamic* humanity, as it has been called; and that has been a favorite conception with some. But this notion of a new creative beginning would, in any case, be difficult to harmonize with the Logos doctrine of the fourth Gospel, and with St. Paul's doctrine concerning Christ as the man from heaven, 1 Cor. 15: 47. According to the fourth Gospel, Jesus is the incarnate Logos who is eternally in God as Son, but who is also from the beginning in the world as the medium of its creation and the principle of its development. His life is the light of men. The beginning of His existence does not date from the moment of His appearance in the flesh. "His goings forth are from of old, even from the days of *olâm*." And He came through the generations of Israel. But how, then, could He have been a new creation miraculously accomplished at some definite moment in time? And if it be true that, as St. John says, "He was in the world" as the principle of its life and light, how then could "His coming to His own" be considered either as a new creation in the world, or as an *advent* from some point outside of the world?

Perhaps we are here in a sphere in which definite conceptions are impossible, and in which every effort to formulate such conceptions must necessarily lead to contradictions. The traditional theology, however, has had no sense of any such difficulty. Its definitions concerning the *new creation*, the *assumption of manhood*, the *one person in two natures*, exhibit a degree of boldness in speculation, which seems to be utterly unconscious of any limita-

tions of power. But if thought on this profound subject was allowable in the past, when creeds and confessions were formed, it must also be allowable now; provided only we bear in mind that we see here only as in a glass, darkly, and that we do not set up our definitions as infallible dogmas to be held as a condition of Church fellowship. What is necessary in order to the existence of the Christian Church itself, and of the Christian faith, is that Christ be recognized as God-man, that is, as truly divine and truly human. But this is possible only on the supposition of an essential kinship or homogeneity between the divine and human natures. No imagination of a new creation or of an assumption of manhood into union with Deity can ever give us the conception of a truly divine-human Christ. He can not be divine, if He be not the Son who is eternally in God and from the beginning in humanity; and He cannot be human, if His coming is not in the order and law of human life. As truly divine and truly human—the Son or Word of God, and the Son of man—He must have appeared as the end of the process of the self-thinking, the self-loving, and the self-expressing energy of God in humanity; the self-realization of the immanent deity in human form, under the conditions and limitations which this form implies. “No form of doctrine,” says Walker in the work already referred to, “which supposes an entrance of the Son of God into the world *as if from without*, in some moment of time, can ever give us both God and man in Christ, with no loss either to the Deity or to the humanity; and our modern knowledge of both nature and revelation has placed us in a position where we should be able to conceive the matter quite differently and much more truly; and yet it is only coming back to the Spirit’s teaching in the fourth Gospel especially, wherein we have the developed doctrine of a real incarnation of the pre-existent Son of God.” Doubtless this realization of the divine sonship in Jesus, and through Him in humanity at large, though ideally and essentially He was always in it as the ground of its life, was something new in relation to humanity as this has stood before; but, as we said before, it was new only as the flower is new to the plant. It

was the fulfillment of the meaning of humanity in its original conception. If any further proof were needed of the correctness of this doctrine of the incarnation as a progressive act and manifestation of God in humanity, we should refer to the *preparation* for His appearance in the history of the world, but especially of Israel. It is, however, not necessary, nor have we room, to pursue this line of thought any further.

But now this conception of the progressive continuity of development is applicable also to the realization of Christian character in the case of the human individual. The Christian man becomes such not by any sudden act of new creation, but by a moral process accomplished through his own action and will. Moral character, Christian character, can never be created off hand. Though never accomplished without divine agency and influence—as is plain from the whole teaching of Scripture, in which so much account is made of divine grace—yet neither is it ever accomplished without moral action on the part of man. Nor is the Christian man a new man in any other sense than that of being a complete realization of the idea of manhood. It is true, there is a distinction made in the Scripture between the *natural*, or *psychical*, man and the *spiritual* man. The man who is not a Christian is a psychical man; the man who is a Christian, on the other hand, is a spiritual man. And those who are spiritual, and are led by the Spirit, they are the sons of God. Now the state of the spiritual man is doubtless something new in the process of human development. That which is first is the natural or psychical, and afterward that which is spiritual, 1 Cor. 15 : 46. The psychical man is the sensuous man, the carnal man, who minds the things of the flesh, that is, the man who thinks, and judges, and acts mainly according to sensuous principles. He is the man of the *understanding*, the faculty which judges according to sense, in the phrase of Coleridge. He is a *calculating animal*, the shrewdest and most cunning of all animals. The psychical man, of course, has a conscience too, or faculty of moral judgment; but it deals for the most part only with abstract and impersonal law, and is therefore not conscience in the fullest sense.

The spiritual man is the man who has risen to the apprehension of infinite and eternal principles, or of an infinite, personal, righteous and holy being, in whose sight he lives and to whom he must give account. He is the man who judges and acts according to the spirit, the man in whom the sense for the spiritual, the infinite, the divine, the true, the good, and the beautiful, has become active and keen. The conscience of the spiritual man has become a faculty that brings him into direct contact with the living God and declares and endorses His will.

This spiritual condition, we say, is something new as compared with the natural or psychical condition; just as the intellectual condition of the full grown man is something new as compared with the intellectual immaturity of the child. Ethically and religiously the Christian man is a new man. The ethics of the heathen world are the ethics of the natural man; and how far those ethics fall below the standard of the Christian, is known to every student of ethical history. How much inferior were Greek and even Jewish ethics to Christian ethics! And, of course, Greek and Jewish religion was equally inferior. At the present day we have a striking illustration of the inferior quality of natural ethics in the case of the Chinese. Intellectually the Chinese people are not inferior to those of western nations. But how utterly devoid they are apparently of anything like a moral or religious nature in our sense of the term? Their morality consists for the most part only in a shrewd calculation of consequences, and their religion has in it neither warmth nor life. Such is the state of the natural man; and in view of the difference between this and the spiritual state as brought to light in Christianity, it may well be said that "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creation, old things are passed away, and all things have become new."

But after all it would be a mistake to ascribe this change to an introduction of a new element into the natural man, either through baptism or through some occult operation of the Holy Spirit. When the child first begins to perform intellectual acts, the intellectual faculty is then only *awakened*, not *created*. And

so, when under the influence of the Christian environment the spiritual nature—the real reason and conscience—is first brought into activity, who would say that at that moment the germ of a new creation, or of a spiritual life, is for the first time implanted into the soul? Should we not rather say that the spiritual nature, which is essentially present in all men, is then first quickened and energized by the pressure of Christian influences? True we read in the Epistle of St. Jude that there are men who are “sensual (or psychical) not having any spirit (or the Spirit)” ; but that does not mean that they are actually without a spiritual nature ; any more than when Peter says that some men are like “creatures without reason, born mere animals to be taken and destroyed,” we should be justified in supposing that some men are created absolutely without a rational nature. What the phrase “without spirit” means is merely that the spiritual nature is relatively latent or dormant, waiting to be awakened and quickened by the presence and power of Christian influences, including, of course, the activity of the Holy Spirit in the Christian community, just as the intellectual nature of the child is waiting to be awakened and quickened by the influence of a teacher. But what, then, it may be asked, is regeneration, if it be not the communication of the substance of a new life, or of the power of a new creation? We answer, it is the out-birth of the complete idea of human nature which has the essential Christ in it from the beginning. It is the quickening of the spiritual nature and the arousing of its energy under the stimulating pressure of the ethical and spiritual environment which Christianity constitutes. It is here that we may appreciate the significance and value of sacraments, and Christian institutions, and forms of worship, and especially of the preaching of the Gospel. They are not magic operations, exercising a creative activity in the souls of men merely by virtue of their own performance. A sacrament as such does not create a new life in the soul to which it is administered ; any more than the warm beams of the spring sun [put life into the germs of seeds which they quicken and start into activity. The sacrament, however, is

therefore not useless in the development of the spiritual life ; any more than the sun is useless in the development of vegetable life. It has meaning and use as a seal of divine grace, as a means of Christian influence, and as a pledge of that Christian society, within whose bosom it is performed, to use its Christian power and influence for the benefit of the subject to which the sacrament is administered. This is the spiritual conception of Christianity, though but very imperfectly presented, which, according to our settled conviction, must take the place of the physical and magical conception derived from the medieval church, in order that Christianity may again exert its utmost power in the world.

A WORD ABOUT THE REVIEW.

With this number closes the fourth volume of the fourth series of the REVIEW. The work of its preparation and publication has devolved much labor upon the Editor. This, however, has been a labor of love. And that it has been appreciated by the friends of the REVIEW is proven by their interest. The number of subscribers has been nearly tripled. And there has never been any lack of material to fill its pages. We here express our thanks to our friends for their coöperation in our work, and also the hope that they will continue it. Let the effort to enlarge the subscription list be continued. We would also ask our old contributors to continue to send us their articles. We shall be glad also to see the list of contributors increase, and propose to make efforts to that effect. We desire fresh articles on live and interesting themes—themes relating to problems of the present day. And we desire articles that have been especially written for the REVIEW, as such will be most likely to interest our readers. Sermons, addresses, and essays prepared for special occasions will not generally be suitable for the REVIEW, unless they are re-written. When a preacher prepares a sermon he has in mind a particular audience, and for that audience only is it a thoroughly good sermon. To make it good for another audience it needs to some extent at least to be reconstructed. So with articles for the

REVIEW. Sermons and occasional essays may often be made into valuable REVIEW articles, but only by re-writing and condensing them, and adapting them to the readers of the REVIEW. Articles should be condensed as much as possible. The value of an article is not always in direct proportion to its length. Ten to fifteen pages is a good length for a REVIEW article. But above all let the thought to be conveyed be expressed perspicuously and concisely. To attain this result it will often be necessary to re-write perhaps more than once. The best masterpieces in all literature were re-written many times. Now some men may think they are too busy to do that. But let them remember that their readers are busy people too ; and that they owe it to give them the best they can give.

OUR BOOK NOTICES.

We want to call our readers' attention to the notices of new books which appear in this REVIEW. These notices are carefully prepared and are intended to be helpful to our readers as well as to publishers. The majority of books noticed are purchased and paid for in the regular way. Some few are furnished gratuitously by the publishers. But whether obtained gratuitously or by purchase, the notices are intended to be fair representations of the books ; and from the abstracts of the contents readers will generally be able to decide whether they will want to purchase books or not. We would also like to call the readers' attention to the note prefacing the Book Notices. All books noticed in this REVIEW, and others, will be furnished at the lowest cash prices by the *Reformed Church Publication Board*, 1306 Arch street, Philadelphia. A discount of from twenty-five to thirty-five per cent. will be allowed the purchaser. Better than that he can probably do nowhere. And yet it will be to the advantage of the *Board* to sell books on such terms ; and it will also indirectly benefit the REVIEW. Why should not ministers and members of the Reformed Church patronize their own Publication Board?

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

[Any books noticed in this department will be furnished, at the lowest prices, by the *Reformed Church Publication Board*, 1306 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.]

HOW MUCH IS LEFT OF THE OLD DOCTRINES? A Book for the People.
By Washington Gladden, D.D. Pages, 321. Price, \$1.25. Houghton, Mifflin and Company, Boston and New York, 1899.

That the old systems of doctrine are not now received with the same degree of confidence with which they were received once, is an acknowledged fact. It is no longer considered sufficient for the credibility of a theological dogma that it was accepted by church fathers and reformers, or that detached passages of Scripture may be quoted in support of it. Doctrines in order to be received now must authenticate themselves to the moral and theoretical reason, as well as prove their consonance with the *teaching of the Bible as a whole*. The modern Christian consciousness has, accordingly, been exercising a critical function in relation to theological doctrines that were once believed to be exempt from all criticism because of their claim to be supernaturally revealed truths. Some of these doctrines have been given up as untenable in the forum of Christian reason as well as in the light of Holy Scripture. Others have been modified, and are now held in new relations, with new and changed emphasis and new meanings. To what extent has this criticism and modification of the old doctrines proceeded? Are the changes which have been effected consistent with the substance of the Christian faith? Is the result favorable or unfavorable to Christianity? These are the questions which Dr. Gladden has undertaken to answer in the volume before us. The form of treatment is popular, and the book is a book for the people. Intelligent Christians of all classes can readily understand it; and yet it will be of special importance to ministers and theological students, who should be profoundly interested in the subjects discussed.

The special topics discussed are the following: *Belief in God; How the Worlds were Made; What is the Supernatural; What is the Bible; Is there a Personal Devil; What do we Inherit; The Doctrine of the Trinity; The Word Made Flesh; How Christ Saves Men; Predestination; Conversion; The Meaning of Baptism; The Significance of the Lord's Supper; The Hope of Immortality; The Thought of Heaven.*

We proceed to give a few of the author's salient positions, so that our readers may the better understand the scope and value

of the book. In the first two sections it is maintained that the new theology has by no means banished the idea of God or of His creative activity. If this were the case, as is sometimes charged by controversialists of more zeal than knowledge, there would be no theology left. It has only removed the conception which presented Him as an infinite tyrant after the manner of earthly rulers in barbarous times, and substituted for it the conception of an infinitely rational, loving, and righteous Father, who is always in His world and present to His children. For the carpenter theory of creation it has substituted the theory of evolution; but this relates only to the method by which the worlds were made, and makes God more directly the Creator of them than did the old theory with its doctrine of "second causes." But how about the supernatural? Is not the new theology anti-supernaturalistic? Yes, if the supernatural be taken in the deistic sense, which makes it to mean merely the miraculous, or the occasional intervention of God in the order of the world; no, if the supernatural be taken to mean the immanent as well as transcendent God Himself, whose power energizes in nature, and who reveals Himself as the Father of our spirits in all the daily events of life. In the article on the Bible it is admitted that the new theology does not treat it as an infallible book; and the author says, p. 70, "The sin and the crime of driving men from the doors of the church are to be charged very largely upon the religious teachers who, with the light of this decade blazing all around them, continue to make statements about the Bible which a very little careful study of the Bible itself will prove to be untrue." But the Bible after all is still recognized as the book which "shows us the forces that are regenerating the world," and tells us "what we most need to know about ourselves."

In so far the new theology has only set the old doctrines in new lights and new perspectives. But in regard to the question of a *personal devil*, it has, according to Dr. Gladden, been more radical. It denies the doctrine of the devil and of an organized kingdom of evil, which has played so important a part in the old theologies, some of which have gone so far as to assert that the assumption of a devil is necessary in order to make room for faith in Christ. Dr. Gladden points out the fact that in the old Israelitish faith there was no devil, and thinks that this dark conception came into the faith of the later Judaism from the dualism of the Persians. "I for my part," he writes, p. 103, "am quite free to say that I do not believe in the existence of any such organized kingdom of evil spirits, ruled by a great Prince or Potentate, and set in deadly array against the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ. If you mean by a personal devil a gigantic evil intelligence whose sole purpose in the universe is the destruction of men's souls, and who commands vast armies of evil spirits in an age-long warfare upon human virtues and happiness, then I say I do not believe in a personal devil." And again, p. 105: "If there is a good God, He has not let loose in the world such a

mighty host of malignant spirits, with such a gigantic malefactor at the head of them, to prey upon the souls of His children." "Satan is simply the aggregate of spiritual wickedness of the world, personified." "If there seems to be in the teaching of Jesus Himself an element which I can not reconcile with this, I think that I honor Him best by passing it by, and waiting for the time to come when I may understand Him better," p. 110.

What do we inherit? To this question Dr. Gladden answers: Not *sin*, not *guilt*, but a *tendency* to sin, which becomes sin only by our own volition. But while there is an evil heredity in all men, there is also a good heredity in all. "What is your parentage? Whose child are you? Is not God you Father? Are you not made in His image? Is it not His nature that you have inherited? And in spite of all that you have done, and of all that has been done by your progenitors to mar and defile the divinity within you, it is there still, the deepest, the most central fact in your history," p. 129. And of this fact the rite of infant baptism is supposed to be a most striking and appropriate symbol. "To my mind," says our author, "the rite of infant baptism is the simple and sublime testimony to the most momentous fact which the human mind can entertain, that every human being is a child of the eternal Father, made to love Him, and know Him, and trust in Him, and fitted for communion with Him," p. 256. It is with this communion also that the Lord's Supper is concerned. After discussing and setting aside the Roman Catholic and other doctrines, which are not accepted in the circles in which the new theology prevails, our author continues, "The deepest purpose of the sacrament is not only to help us to think about Christ, and to be grateful to Him, but also to bring us into vital, spiritual fellowship with Him, so that we shall have His mind in us, and be partakers of His nature; so that His life shall be reproduced in our lives, and we shall in some measure learn to see the world with His eyes, to think as He thought, to feel as He felt, and to act as He acted," p. 277.

On the subject of the Trinity the author maintains that the old traditional doctrine was essentially tritheistic. To say that God is *three persons* is to destroy the thought of unity. And yet the idea of a *living* God also excludes the idea of an abstract unity. On this subject Dr. Gladden adopts the language of Dr. Whiton, who says: "The Trinity of the Living God must be a Trinity in His Life. And this, according to the Scriptural idea of God, must include these three terms: the transcendent Divine Life that is above the world, the immanent Divine Life that is universal through the world and perfected in the Christ, and the individualized Divine Life that is begotten in each separate consciousness and conscience," p. 150. This leads us to glance at the author's conception of the incarnation. The basis of this is the idea of *kinship* between God and man. This does away with the difficulties in the notion of two natures in one person. Christ's incarnation is, in the language of Dr. Dale, "not an isolated and abnormal

wonder. It was God's witness to the true and ideal relation of all men to God." The realization of this fact in the minds of men is the Christian salvation. Christ saves men, not by outwitting or satisfying any devil, nor by appeasing the wrath of God, but by working a change in the sinner's conscience. This is the atonement, or reconciliation, spoken of in the New Testament. The moral change is attributed to God on the same principle that we constantly transfer subjective states to objective realities.

We had intended to notice our author's treatment of the subject of predestination, of the church, of conversion, of the hope of immortality, and of the thought of heaven. But this notice has grown to sufficient length. What we meant to do was only to write a *notice*, not a criticism or review. We make no criticism at all, and express no judgment. Some of the views presented in this volume will of course strike some readers as strange, as un-Biblical, and untenable. But let them be studied, and let them be viewed in relation to fundamental Christian principles. That is the only way in which they can be proved or disproved. Take the fundamental conception that "God is Love," or that God is good, and reasonable, and righteous, and with that touchstone test the doctrines of the old as well as the new theologies. Any one who will do that we are sure will get, if not a new theology, at least a truer theology, and one that he can preach with better effect, than the doctrines which he has merely taken on trust from tradition. To this end we heartily commend this volume of Dr. Gladden's. It is delightfully written in clear and flowing English. It is, like all of Dr. Gladden's writings, a model of style, and will amply pay for its cost and for the time and labor of perusal.

METAPHYSICS. By Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University. Revised Edition. Pages, xiv + 429. Harper and Brothers, New York and London, 1898.

This work forms a companion volume to the author's *Theory of Thought and Knowledge*, published a year earlier, and noticed at the time in this REVIEW. These two volumes cover the ground of speculative philosophy. In the one first published the main question discussed is: How is knowledge possible? In the one now before us it is: What is reality? The science of metaphysics does not aim at a detailed knowledge of particular things, such as the special sciences are designed to give, but rather at an outline conception of reality as such, within which all knowledge of particular things must fall, and by which such knowledge must be judged. It inquires into the real significance of those categories of being and cause, of change and identity, space and time, and the rest, which in epistemology are shown to be principles of thought. What validity do these principles have for reality? How must we think of reality? These and similar questions form the problems with which metaphysics has to deal. And as its ultimate aim is to rationalize and comprehend experience, it fol-

lows that it must begin with and proceed along the line of experience. And this accordingly is the method pursued in the work before us.

The work is divided into three parts, the first treating of *Ontology*, the second of *Cosmology*, and the third of *Psychology*. In the first part the author discusses, in five chapters, respectively, *the notion of being, the nature of things, change and identity, causality, and the world-ground*. We shall endeavor to reproduce briefly a few of the leading ideas of this part. And we shall begin with the author's conception of *being*. He rejects as a mere logical fiction the notion of *pure being*, which according to Hegel is identical with not being. This is merely an abstraction of thought that can have nothing corresponding to it in reality. The same is true of the notion of *substance* as a mere passive receptacle for qualities and attributes. There can be no such thing as substance in this sense. The essential mark of being or substance is action. Only the definite and the active can be viewed as ontologically real. The realities of the universe are powers, not dead substances or lumps of pure being. The phenomenal universe is but the manifestation of hidden powers. All reality, accordingly, must be causal; and the fundamental conception of being must be regarded as a dynamic conception. This conception determines the notion of what may be called the *nature of things*—the essence, the *what*, the *quiditas*. This is not to be expressed by the term quality, as is usually supposed, but must be defined as the law or principle which determines the form of action. It is the law or rule according to which a thing acts or changes that constitutes its essence. But this makes the world an intellectual system, which has reality only through the intellect constituting it. The reality of the world is ideal; and apart from the thinking mind it has no reality at all. This agrees with Kant's dictum that "the understanding makes nature," only there is this difference, that according to Professor Bowne the understanding, or the consciousness, which makes nature, is not the finite or human consciousness, but the infinite or absolute consciousness, of which every finite mind itself is a mode. In this construction of the fundamental metaphysical conception, it will be observed, Professor Bowne essentially agrees with the two profoundest philosophical thinkers of this age, namely, Herman Lotze and Thomas H. Green.

The conception of the nature of being necessarily determines the idea of causation, or the more general idea of interaction between different things. Interaction is not something that takes place between things as independent agents, but something which takes place in things as dependent upon one fundamental reality. The interaction of the many is possible only through the unity and immanent action of the all-embracing, infinite, and absolute one, the eternal world-ground. This theory of causation, which is also the theory of Lotze, reminds us of the *occasionalism* of

Geulinx and Malbranche, and will for many minds constitute a difficulty in the way of the acceptance of the metaphysical system here presented. According to this theory of causation one being can act upon another, not directly, or immediately, but only in the round-about way of the infinite. To common sense this will be a thought difficult to admit or to comprehend. But if it be remembered that in any case the relations which things sustain to each other in the universe must be supposed to be established by the eternal world-ground, and to be forever maintained by that ground, it will be perceived that the conception of causation here under consideration is after all not so unreasonable as it may at first sight appear to common sense. Why will one ball when striking another communicate its motion to that one? Only in consequence of the law which holds all things in the universe together in one system. But that law is an ideal energy constantly exercised by the creative mind which is the ground of all things. This world-ground is by Professor Bowne defined as free and active intelligence. This means that God is personal, that is, that He knows and determines Himself and His activities. To the question which is now so eagerly debated by many, whether God is immanent or transcendent to the world, Professor Bowne would answer that, in the sense in which the terms are usually understood, He is neither. In a spatial sense God is neither in the world or out of it. He is in the world only as mind is in its thoughts, unspatially and unpicturably. And those who can think of God only, in the process of creation for instance, as acting upon the world *from without*, thereby show that they are capable of thinking only in pictures of sense, and can therefore properly have no voice in the determination of such high themes. In this connection we give our author's definition of creation. To create, he says, means, positively, to posit in existence something that before was not, and, negatively, not to make anything out of pre-existing material, nor out of the Creator in such sense as to make His being afterwards less than it was before. This of course is not explaining the process of creation. In fact our author agrees with Lotze and Green, in repeatedly warning us that we should not imagine that we can either understand or explain *how things were made*.

The special topics discussed in the second part are *space, time, matter, force and motion*, and *nature*. Space and time are not objective realities, or ontological facts, but functions of self-conscious intelligence, or forms of experience and intuition. They are not realities existing before things, nor are they objective qualities or forms of things. Things are not in space and time, but on the contrary space and time are in things. This view follows from the proposition that the world exists only in and for intelligence. If all intelligence were taken away there would be no world. It is intelligence that posits the world as real, and space and time are conditions of the reality thus posited. They

are not in the mental act. The mind and its activity is neither spatial nor temporal. These conceptions must be restricted to phenomenal existence only. This view will probably be admitted at once so far as the idea of space is concerned. Of course the mind and its acts can not be represented under the category of space. But how is it with the idea of time? Is there not succession in the acts of the mind, and does not that prove that the mind itself is a thing coming under the category of time? So it appears at first view; but further reflection we think will show that this is a mistaken view. Mental activity is change in the mental subject, and this change establishes the phenomenon of time, which phenomenon is, however, by no means a quality of the subject. And this is true not merely of the infinite subject, or of the creative subject, but of the finite subject as well. The infinite intelligence, as intelligence, is of course timeless, that is, it has no real before and after in it, but it *establishes* temporal relations in finite things. But in this respect the finite intelligence which is a mode of the infinite, is like unto the infinite. In its being, and in the activity by which the temporal is realized, there is likewise no temporality. If this conception of the *timelessness* of the human mind be a true conception, every one can understand its bearing upon the question of the eternal existence of the soul or of immortality. Is it a true conception? That question is capable of being answered by an appeal to consciousness, which any one can make for himself.

What is matter? The most common view is that matter is composed of atoms which are solids extended in space and exercising energy. A little reflection, however, will show that this view is beset with insuperable difficulties. Professor Bowne, after an extended discussion, accordingly comes to the conclusion that the material world is not composed of atoms and their forces, but of one infinite, omnipresent, eternal energy, by which it is continually supported, and from which it incessantly proceeds. The universe therefore has only phenomenal existence. Its reality is the causality behind it. But is not the world, nature, a continuous, abiding order of existence? Yes, but what is this continuity of nature? Does it belong to the phenomenal order, or to the reality lying behind the phenomenal? The continuity of nature, says Professor Bowne, is to be found in the continuous validity of the system of law, and in the continuity of thought, of which nature is the flowing expression. This leads to the consideration of the subject of evolution. Professor Bowne, like other metaphysicians, takes far less interest in this subject than non-metaphysical scientists do. The theory of evolution is merely a description of the phenomenal order. It is a statement of the method according to which the world is posited by the infinite subject, but it says nothing about the causation or reality back of the phenomenal order. Phenomenally it is quite likely that one order of being was evolved from another, man from some

order of animals. Ontologically it is the infinite subject that posits every existing being with its constitutive qualities. Hence those theologians who are afraid that the theory of evolution will dim the glory of the Creator might be delivered from their fear by a little taste of metaphysics. This conception of nature has an immediate bearing also upon the notion of the *supernatural*, and of *miracles*. The supernatural, says Professor Bowne, is nothing foreign to the natural and making occasional raids into nature; but so far as nature as a whole is concerned, the supernatural is the ever-present ground of the natural. The miracle could only be viewed as an event arriving apart from the accustomed order of nature, and defying reduction to rule. As such it is possible, but in view of the constancy of nature not easily credible. In fact nothing can save us from rejecting miraculous stories as antecedently incredible, except the showing of an adequate reason for their performance.

The subject of the last part of the work under notice is *psychology*; and in this is treated the *nature of the soul*, or its *being and origin*, its *relation to the body*, the *mental mechanism*, and *freedom and necessity*. The author in conformity with his ontological principles dismisses the theory of materialism, as well as the common theory of monism. Nor has he any favor for the vulgar doctrine of mind-stuff as something distinct from matter. Mind is nothing but active intelligence. The self as we know it is the only reality there is to know. As to the origin of souls Professor Bowne rejects the doctrine of traducianism, and adopts the doctrine of creationism. In the production of souls parents are not creators. They and their deeds are only the occasions on which the world-ground produces new effects, and introduces new factors into the system. The theory of creationism has been opposed because of the difficulty to which it gives rise in relation to the doctrine of original sin. But this is vicious logic. If the doctrine of a divine production of souls is inconsistent with the doctrine of original sin, then the doctrine of original sin must give way. On the subject of freedom the author insists that freedom is a property of the reason no less than of the will. Man is free in the totality of his being. But this freedom has its limitations in the conditions of finite existence.

But we must bring this *notice* to a close. We have given a few of the leading ideas of this book in order to show its importance, and the importance of the subject with which it deals. The study of this work in connection with the same author's *Theory of Thought and Knowledge* would be a philosophical education of immense value to Christian ministers in these days of theological uncertainty and doubt. The foundations of theology must be laid in philosophy. On this point we differ with our Ritschlian friends. While we agree with them that theology should not be identified with religion, and that above all things Christianity should not be supposed to consist in dogmas; yet we are aware

also of the importance of theology as the scientific explanation, never complete and perfect, of our religion; and in order to this we need a secure basis in philosophy. As such we recommend this system of Professor Bowne's. It may not be in all points perfectly satisfactory, and may leave some difficulties still unsolved. But it is an able effort to put philosophy in a form to make it generally intelligible; and its substantial agreement with the best thought of modern times vouches for its essential correctness. At any rate we commend this book to our readers as one which in many ways will do them good.

TRUSTS OR COMPETITION? BOTH SIDES OF THE GREAT QUESTION IN BUSINESS, LAW, AND POLITICS. Edited by Gen. A. B. Nettleton, A.M., Former Assistant Secretary of Treasury. Pages, 304. The Leon Publishing Company, Chicago, 1900.

The trust question is one of the live questions of the age. And it is a question in regard to which the American citizen will want the most thorough and the most reliable information. As a political question it is of far more importance than the currency question; for it involves the question whether the masses of mankind shall have any money at all, which is rather more serious than the question what kind of money they shall have. Now the information needed by the ordinary citizen in order to enable him to come to an intelligent understanding of the question, and to give an intelligent vote on the subject, is furnished by this book of General Nettleton's. General Nettleton was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury during the administration of Mr. Harrison. No one, therefore, can question his ability and his will to present the subject in its true light. He has had opportunities to study the subject such as few possess; and he did not come to this study with a mind prejudiced against the institution of the trust. That he came to an unfavorable conclusion in regard to it was due solely to the weight of reason.

A considerable part of the volume before us, however, is not of Gen. Nettleton's own composition. He gives the views of a large number of earnest and able thinkers on the subject—of statesmen, economists, and social philosophers of the highest standing—whose opinions can not be lightly set aside. These views are given in the form of elaborate addresses and papers published originally in various periodicals. Gen. Nettleton's own contribution to the work consists of a full and clear résumé of the arguments both for and against the trust. In favor of the trust it is usually argued that competition is a failure in the conditions of modern industry, and that the trust is a necessary product of economic and social evolution. It prevents the waste of competition, reduces the cost of producing and marketing commodities, secures more steady employment and better wages to the laborer, lower prices of goods, secures opportunities for investment to people of means, and enlarges our foreign trade. There is some

force in these arguments, which is admitted by the author of this volume, and by the eminent writers therein quoted. Competition may be wasteful, as it is for instance when two lines of railroad are built where one would be sufficient, or two manufacturing plants established where one only can live. Manufacturing on a large scale, with the use of modern machinery, is more economical than manufacturing on a small scale. But over against these benefits of the combination of capital in the form of trusts must be set the evils which they produce. The chiefest of these is *monopoly*. The idea of the trust is never realized until every industry has become a monopoly; and the economic effects of that are worse than all the evils produced by competition. It puts all the power of industry and of capital in the country into the hands of a few men; and these will use that power for selfish ends. It is said that monopolistic industry will enable the managers to pay higher wages to laborers and to sell cheaper goods. But the answer to this is that *they will never do it*. What they *might* do and what they *will* do are different things. Mr. Havemeyer, the king of the sugar trust, being asked as to the *ethics* of his proceeding, answered: "I don't care two cents for your ethics—I am in this for business." That is the fact. Men go into monopolies, not for benevolence, but for business; and human nature being as it is, private monopolies will always be oppressive. Other arguments against the trust are the watering of stocks, the concentration of factories, the oppression of laborers, and the destruction of industrial opportunity for the masses. "A large section of the generation of young men now facing the twentieth century," says Gen. Nettleton, "will find themselves disinherited of opportunity if the trust system succeeds in establishing the principle of private monopoly, and in holding the domain it has seized."

In opposition to the view that the trust system is a necessary and inevitable product of economic evolution, Gen. Nettleton maintains that it is the artificial result of the greed and cunning of a comparatively small number of selfish but able and powerful men. After having stated a number of facts in support of this contention, he says: "In the light of these facts it becomes manifest that the central and determining element in the trust movement, monopoly, is not in any sense nor to any extent whatever an economic evolution, an orderly development from preceding conditions under the stress of an imperious law which nobody can either understand or resist. On the contrary it is shown to be an artificially stimulated movement, solely prompted by ordinary, vulgar human motives and enabled to succeed for the time partly because of extraordinary investment conditions in this country, but mainly because of the previous neglect of the public to provide adequate legal safeguards against forms of private monopoly which until recently, no one suspected would ever invade popular rights." In opposition to the idea that the trust system is a natural and necessary evolution, Gen. Nettleton also intro-

duces a large amount of evidence showing that nothing like this system exists in any European country.

In conclusion we can not do better than quote from the preface Gen. Nettleton's own words concerning the result of his study of this subject. After saying that he began his study under the conviction that the trust "movement was legitimate, beneficial and permanent, requiring only regulation and guidance to safeguard the public welfare," he continues as follows: "In a word I have emerged from my study of the monopoly movement profoundly convinced (1) that it is fundamentally wrong in theory and incurably evil in practice; (2) that, in the luminous words of President Hadley, of Yale, it is a system which 'makes increased economy in production a pretext for monopolizing the market'; (3) that its claimed advantages, so far as they are legitimate, are equally attained by corporations and concerns engaged in modern large-scale production with adequate capital, without any resort to monopoly; (4) that the trust system forcibly adds to natural industrial development, which all approve, the alien element of arbitrary monopoly, which none should tolerate; (5) that (unless it is to serve as a stepping-stone to socialism) the trust system will endure only until the people give to their highest courts an opportunity to apply the law, not to its regulation, which would be futile, but to its removal, which is entirely practicable. For this radical reversal of opinion on a great and pressing question, I offer no word of apology." It will be observed that Gen. Nettleton is not opposed to corporations. These are legitimate; but they must be prevented by effective legislation from growing into monopolies.

THE PROBLEM OF FINAL DESTINY, Studied in the Light of Revised Theological Statement. By William B. Brown, D.D., Pastor-Emeritus of the First Congregational Church, Newark, N. J. Pages, 319. Price, \$1.50. Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House, New York, 1900.

This volume is the work of an octogenarian, and its conclusions should therefore be regarded as the result of long study and of ripe judgment. The problem is one that has engaged the author's mind for many years, and the charge can not be made against him that his views are the product of youthful imagination or of hasty reflection. Nor are these views such as he always held. There are evidences in the book itself showing that the author once held contrary views, and that he has attained his present convictions only after long and careful study and after many struggles. He is a man who has kept intellectually alive and awake up to an age when most men have long quit thinking. In that regard his work should serve as an encouragement to theologians and preachers of advancing years. It is usually supposed that preachers having passed the fifties are no longer capable of vigorous intellectual activity and that they must of necessity be dull. Perhaps many have given occasion for this unfavorable judgment; but there is no reason why the fact should be as supposed. And this book of

Dr. Brown's proves that a man need not necessarily be a dotard at the age of eighty.

The method of the book is inductive. The author does not state his conclusion, and then bring forward arguments for its demonstration. On the contrary he presents a study of the nature of God and man by means of all attainable light, and makes all bear upon the question of man's final destiny. The book is therefore far more than an ordinary discussion of the topics of eschatology. Separate chapters are devoted to the personality of God, the Trinity, the attributes of God, the nature of man, creation by evolution, the character of the Bible, sin, Christ and His Gospel, the atonement, and similar topics. Thus the book comes in fact to be a complete system of theology, from which are omitted only those topics which have no bearing on human destiny and which can therefore have no relation to piety. In the treatment of these topics the author usually adheres to the orthodox system of theology. It is, however, not the *old* but the *new* orthodoxy. For instance, while he accepts the doctrine of the Divine Trinity, he holds that this does not mean *tripersonality* in God. The idea of *one God consisting of three persons*, he contends, is tri-theism, and can be nothing else. He begins the discussion of this subject by the statement, in which we suppose all will agree, "that the exact mode of God's existence is, and ever must be incomprehensible to finite beings." On the subject of the Bible he agrees with those who make a distinction between the Scriptures and the Word of God, and accept the former as a faithful record of revelation, but not as infallible.

But we must pass from these points to the main issue of the book, namely, the problem of final destiny. The author's conclusion on this problem may be given in his own words. On page 307 he states it negatively: "That the creedal and traditional Theory of Final Destiny is not sustained, and that almost the reverse of what it claims must be true." By the creedal theory he means the theory of the creeds of Catholic as well as Protestant Christendom. And this theory, as he apprehends it, teaches that man's eternal destiny is fixed in the present life, that after death there is no chance of salvation, and that consequently eternal existence will be for the great majority of mankind an infinite curse instead of blessing. This theory, he claims, can not be sustained in the light of what we know, from reason and revelation, of God's nature and character, and of man's present constitution and endowments. His positive conclusion he states in the following propositions: "1. That love is the sum of God's moral character, and that, therefore, He does and must do for each member of the human family,—all of them His children and He their Father,—everything that infinite wisdom and infinite power controlled by perfect love could do to promote their highest and eternal well-being. 2. That God will, therefore, give to every soul born into the world and made immortal, not only a possible chance, but the

very best of opportunities to be saved, so that a favorable outcome of existence will, in the end, be far more natural and probable than the opposite alternative. 3. That, on the commonly accepted system of theological belief no such opportunity for the great majority of mankind is given in the world; and, that, for this and other reasons, the work of God's loving and saving grace must be and will be extended into the intermediate state. 4. That the doctrine of eternal torment, by positive infliction, as taught in the creeds and often preached, can not be literally true."

Dr. Brown, it will be observed, is not a Universalist in the ordinary sense of that term, as applied to the elder Ballou, for instance, namely, the sense that all men, regardless of character here, will be saved at death, and enter at once into glory. He does not suppose that God is indifferent to good and evil. He holds that God's law of universal order, or the "Law of Natural Consequences," must necessarily bring its own penalty to the sinner. That penalty, however, is not an external infliction but is executed through the sinner's conscience, consisting in a feeling of ill desert and remorse. But this feeling of remorse which may come over an unsaved soul after death, is not in itself eternal punishment, but may be the beginning of repentance and salvation. This remorse must necessarily endure as long as sin endures; but no one has a right to say that it will endure for ever. So long as there is moral pain there is an element of goodness in the soul, and there is freedom; and no one can foretell what freedom may do. It is possible for a soul, perhaps, to remain forever impenitent. But no one can affirm that this possibility will be realized in any single case. No Scriptural statements can have any dogmatic value in regard to the question whether few, or many, or all will be saved. If some should not be saved, what would be their condition? Would they be annihilated? The author thinks not. "Would they be in great anguish or despair? No. Would they be anxious to escape from their condition and go with the blest? No. Would their existence be to them a curse and not a conscious blessing? No. What then, if such beings exist, would they be and do? I answer they would still have their reward. What they would desire above all else is animal, sensual, selfish gratification; and this they would be permitted to enjoy. Such low spirits would group together in some dark corner of the universe and find such enjoyment as they might and could obtain. Their punishment would consist, not so much in conscious misery as in loss of being and of high enjoyment. Does God hate such souls? Are they objects of His wrath? No. God is love. He pities them, and would do them infinite good, if they would let Him. Their existence cannot be called an unmitigated curse, for they enjoy it. But it is eternal penalty because of eternal separation from God and from spiritual good, and so is eternal loss, all the result of violated moral law, which itself is alienation from God and spiritual death."

We have read this book with more than ordinary interest, and have found it to be suggestive and instructive. It is written in a clear style, and no reader of ordinary intelligence need ever to be at a loss as to the author's meaning. The reading of it requires no wearisome, painful effort of attention. It is so constructed as to call out and keep up the attention, and make it a pleasure. There are some minor points in regard to which we could not agree with the positions of the author. It is evident that he has worked himself out of the old "creedal and traditional" theories gradually, but he sometimes inadvertently relapses into the old positions. For instance, he knows the conclusions of the literary criticism of the Bible very well, and accepts them, and yet sometimes he incidentally writes as if he had forgotten them. But these are small matters. Taken as a whole the book is a strong one; and those who have doubts or difficulties in regard to the theological teaching concerning man's final destiny, will find it helpful. Time was when such books would have been considered dangerous. To maintain that the possibility of salvation extends into the intermediate state after death, and that eternal existence will be an infinite blessing to most souls, and an infinite curse to none, would have been supposed to tend to religious indifference. It is so no longer. On the contrary it is the hard doctrines of the old creeds and theologies that give rise to the most difficulties in regard to the Christian religion. And for this reason such a book as this should be hailed with joy.

RECONCILIATION BY INCARNATION. THE RECONCILIATION OF GOD AND MAN BY THE INCARNATION OF THE DIVINE WORD. By D. W. Simon, D.D., Principal of the United College, Bradford. Pages, xxiii + 387. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1898.

The author of this volume is the translator of Dörner's *History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*. The performance of a work like that would not only demonstrate a man's ability for theological thinking, but would itself be a valuable preparation for the undertaking of a work like that with which we are here concerned. In a formal or linguistic point of view, however, there would probably be also some disadvantage in this relation. The long continued study of Dörner's style of writing would likely exercise some influence over one's manner of expressing himself in English. We think we detect evidences of such influence in the work now under notice. The sentences are often long and involved, and the author not infrequently coins new words, and uses new combinations of words, all of which reminds one more or less of the style of Dörner. The language of the book, however, is always correct, and the reader can readily understand it if he is willing to read with a *sufficient degree of attention*. No one, however, need to approach it who has not learned the art of mental concentration, and formed the habit of giving the utmost attention to what he is reading. Something of the difficulty of

the style of the book, of course, is due to the nature of the subject. No one could write on a subject so profound and difficult as that with which this book is concerned, in a style as easy and transparent as that which one expects in a work of simple narrative or of fiction. But notwithstanding some heaviness of style, students of theology who approach the work with a determination to master its contents, can not fail to be enriched and benefited by its perusal.

The underlying principle of the book is expressed in the title: *Reconciliation by Incarnation*. That points at once to a deeper view of the subject than that expressed either in the *forensic* or in the *moral* theory of the atonement. Indeed we are advised in the preface that we should not look in this volume for any orthodox system of doctrine on the subject treated. In fact the author maintains that, in Protestantism at least, there is no such thing as an orthodox dogma. "If 'orthodox' be applied to the *faith once delivered to the saints*, to the *credenda*—in this case the *credenda* of the atonement and the incarnation—there is such a thing as orthodoxy and a standard of orthodoxy; or rather, to coin a word, *arthopistiy*." "But if 'orthodoxy' be understood, as is only too frequently the case, in the sense of a certain right, recognized 'doctrine,' systematic formulation or statement, explanation or theory of these *credenda*, there is not now, and there never was, any such things, at all events, in Protestantism." A dogma, in the old sense of the term, is a divinely revealed and ecclesiastically formulated and authorized doctrine. In this sense certainly there is no dogma of the atonement. There are various theories or explanations of the *credenda*, the things believed, on this subject; but no one of these has ever been accepted by all Christian believers, and any theologian may, therefore, feel free to elaborate his own theories, unconcerned whether they agree or disagree with those of his predecessors. No Protestant theologian would be willing to imitate Rabbi Eliezer Hyrkanus, "who was praised for holding and giving out the teachings of his teacher like a water-tight cistern."

If now an expressive title were desired for the designation of the theory presented in this work of Dr. Simon, we might call it a *bio-dynamic theory*. It is not the satisfaction of divine justice, nor the exhibition of a moral example, that the atonement consists in, but the infusion into the human race of new divine energy, or rather a new potentiation of the divine energy by which humanity is constituted, and in consequence of this the rectification of the abnormal relation between God and man induced by the fact of sin. This theory is based upon a certain cosmological doctrine, to the elucidation of which the first 164 pages of the work before us are devoted. Man, according to Dr. Simon, is constituted by a special differentiation of divine or cosmic energy, embodied in specially integrated matter, the constitution being controlled by a correspondingly differentiated idea or law of the Divine Logos. The

author accepts the fact of the Divine Trinity, though not precisely in the form in which it is presented in the creeds. Instead of saying that there are three distinct persons in the divine essence, he says that there are three personific factors in the Godhead, but neither one of these is personal apart from the others. Though each has a centre of His own, and is to Himself what the others are not, yet each is a person only in and through the rest, and God is in reality uni-personal. The Father is the matter-producing factor in the deity, the Logos, the source of ideas and of law, and the Spirit the source of energy and power. This gives us the scheme of cosmology which the author makes the basis of his doctrine of the atonement. In this scheme of cosmology the idea of evolution occupies a prominent place. The evolving process of the universe is a process of differentiation of energy through the Spirit under the direction of the law of the Logos. The divine energy, however, embodying the divine intelligence, when it enters into the universe and becomes cosmic, undergoes a certain obscuration or *kenosis*; that is to say, while it never becomes separated from its source, it nevertheless goes forward in a manner unconsciously to God. God unconsciously exercises energy determined by law. Here, then, there is room for the doctrine of evolution in the universe by the operation of an immanent divine energy and an inherent law. This conception determines men's relation to God and gives form to the doctrine of reconciliation.

God's relation to man is both an *immanent* and a *transcendent* relation. The former determines the differentiation of energy which in its permanent result forms the essential constitution of man. The transcendent relation, which our author also calls *environment* of man by God, is both *personal* and *vital* or *bio-dynamic*. The personal relation is actualized in thought, knowledge, affection, feeling, self-possession and self-control. This is mutual between God and man. The vital or bio-dynamic relation, which is necessary to man's normal development, consists in the communication of a specific form of divine energy, by means of which the spiritual life is kept up, and the discharge of spiritual functions in their proper form made possible. These relations condition each other. If the personal relation is disturbed, as it is in the case of sin, the vital relation is disturbed likewise; and then a rectification of the personal relation is possible only through a rectification of the vital. Sin is a disturbance of the personal relation of God and man. It forces from God a judgment of disapprobation, causes God grief and sorrow, and inflicts upon man pain and suffering. This abnormal relation can not be rectified by its perpetuation. The infliction of punishment would not rectify it. Punishment itself is a part of the abnormal relation; and the punishment of the sinner could never make this relation right again. And still less could the punishment of an innocent person in the place of the guilty accomplish this result.

The conditions of reconciliation, according to Dr. Simon, are, first, the condemnation by man of sin from the divine point of view, and the consequent justification of the divine resentment; secondly, the sorrowing by man at the pain and sorrow caused to God; and, thirdly, a sincere desire to make amends for the injury inflicted on God. Man, the sinner, must be able to enter into the divine mind and see sin as God sees it, and condemn it as He condemns it. He must sympathize with the divine grief and pain, and feel it himself as God feels it. And, finally, he must earnestly desire to make satisfaction for sin. This does not mean the idea of purchasing the divine favor by means of some offering or gift, or of turning away the divine wrath by some presentation of pain and suffering. This was the idea of atoning sacrifice which prevailed largely in the heathen and also in the Jewish world; and this mistaken idea was itself a part of the abnormal relation of man to God. The Christian idea of satisfaction is the idea of doing something for the pleasure of God *after* there has been an experience of His forgiving grace. Now in order to the fulfillment of these conditions, says Dr. Simon, it is necessary, first, that "every man be *energized* to enter into the mind of God; and, secondly, that the *energizing* process be carried out within the human race itself, in accordance with the feature of its constitution as an organism"; to the elucidation of which thought a chapter is devoted. "Now, he on whom devolves the function of quickening or potentiating every member of the organism of humanity for the fulfillment of these conditions, must clearly be capable of receiving and transmitting a measure of divine energy transcendently great, and the experiences by which it is to be specifically modified for the purpose in question must be deep and varied beyond all estimate."

This function of redemption can be accomplished only by the Logos in human form. His entrance into this form is essentially a process of self-limitation or *kenosis*. Such *kenosis* was not simply made necessary by the fact of sin. Even apart from sin the Divine Logos must have limited not only His power but also His knowledge in order to make possible the existence of a personal and free creature. Of course His entrance into a sinful humanity made necessary a deeper humiliation. He entered into humanity in such way as to share its entire lot. He endured its temptation, felt the shame and pain of its guilt, and suffered the death which is the wages of sin; and then having risen from the dead and been glorified, He imparted to the race a new spiritual energy, which is realized by individual persons through the stimulating effect of the Gospel accompanied by the new energy of the Spirit. The energy stored in Christ as the Head of the race is the organic redemption of the race. In regard to the death of Christ in which the orthodox theology has usually seen the whole matter of the atonement, the author holds that two errors are to be avoided. The first is the error that the suffering of death was the

sole end and aim of the mission of the Son of God. It is doubtless an important factor in the process by which He became the Redeemer of the world, but it is not the sole nor the most important factor. He died because He was a man, and could not have been a perfect man without dying. The second error is the idea that *the death of the cross* was a necessary form of death for the Son of God. In the nature of things, and for the redemption of the world, it was not even necessary that He should die a violent death at all. Had he died an ordinary death it would have had for Him the same significance, although the death of the cross adds something to its dramatic effect in the proclamation of the Gospel.

We have tried to give an objective representation of the main contents of this book, and thus to put our readers into the position of being able to judge of its merits for themselves. Of course this could only be done very imperfectly in the space at our command. But all can see that we have here a theory of the atonement that differs essentially from the current orthodox theories, and one that possesses obvious advantages over these. The difficulty with these theories is that they are either insufficient or immoral. The moral theory does not satisfy the Christian reason, nor the statements of Scripture. The vicarious satisfaction theory of Anselm and the vicarious punishment theory of the Reformers, as well as the governmental theory of more recent times, are untenable in the light of Christian morality. The punishment of an innocent person instead of the guilty is an injustice by which the world's wrong could not be made right. Innocent suffering is a fact of daily observation, but it discharges no guilt and makes no atonement. The theory of atonement presented by Dr. Simon is free from these difficulties. It may have difficulties of its own, however. One of these is perhaps that it is not so easily intelligible as some of the other theories are. That is a fact, however, which does not weigh much with the thoughtful theologian. But some will find more substantial difficulties. Some of these are not essential to the arguments; as for instance, when on page 13, matter is said to be non-intelligible, non-rational, passive, inert, a dark, mysterious riddle. The doctrine of the *kenosis* as here stated is free from some of the difficulties by which it has usually been beset, but some will still find difficulties therein. Many will not be satisfied by the way in which the death of Christ is here treated. But these, unless it be the last, are not serious matters. And many readers of this book—and we hope it will have many—will find that the theory of the atonement here presented is essentially the same that has been repeatedly presented in the pages of this REVIEW, as for instance in an editorial article in the *April number* of the current year.

THE SPIRIT AND THE INCARNATION, in the *Light of Scripture, Science and Practical Need*. By the Rev. W. L. Walker, Laurecekirk (formerly of Glasgow). Pages, vii + 388. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1899.

The significance of this work in its bearing upon the theological thought of the present time fully equals, if it does not surpass, that of the work referred to in the preceding notice, and neither of them could well be valued too highly. The writer of this work is one who has pondered long and deeply some of the profoundest problems of Christianity. Like many another living thinker, who began his theological career at the time when the "traditional orthodoxy" was still in the ascendant, he had his struggles, and "for a time lost all faith in the ordinary evangelical conception of Christianity." But out of this temporary eclipse of faith there has grown a new faith, and a new construction of the leading doctrines of Christianity. This new construction of Christian doctrine, it is believed, does full justice to the teaching of Sacred Scripture and to the present needs of the human spirit. It should be observed, however, at once that this reconstruction of Christian doctrine involves a changed attitude with reference to Scripture itself. This change may be expressed in the author's own language, as follows: "It will not do to quote texts merely. Our whole attitude towards the scriptures has been, indeed, gradually changing, so that while they still remain the *norm* for all Christian doctrine, they can not be indiscriminately held forth as final authority in the way they once were, with the expectation that men will at once bow to the letter." This means that the conception of the Bible as a collection of oracles possessing literal infallibility has given way, and cannot again be reinstated among real Christian thinkers. Important doctrines can no longer be suspended upon single texts. But the Bible as a whole still is, and will always remain, the rule of Christian teaching.

As indicating the fundamental conceptions of the work under consideration we quote the following sentence from the preface: "So far as I know, the view of the Spirit and its work (the author nearly always uses the *neuter* pronoun with reference to the Spirit), culminating in the incarnation, and again proceeding in greater fulness therefrom, including in it the actual presence and power of the living Christ, and of the incarnation as the result of a *process* embracing the entire Divine working in Nature and in Grace (while at the same time the actual personal entrance of God into our humanity), has not yet been formally set forth, although many lines of thought are leading towards the conception of the incarnation as a process; and it is in this view I believe we shall be able to obtain a Christian Theology which does justice to both the Divine and the human in Christ, and shows us God as becoming truly incarnate in Him who was the Head of our Humanity." It will be observed that the author regards the idea of the incarnation as a gradual process brought to pass in humanity through the agency of the Divine Spirit, as the fundamental contribution

to Christian thought which he has to make. His discussion turns upon the conceptions of the Holy Spirit and of the person of Christ; as these constitute the essential features of Christianity. The great distinctive thing in Christianity is the gift of the Holy Spirit. Christianity is the dispensation of the Spirit—the entrance into the world through Jesus Christ of a new principle in some sense of spiritual light and life, called the Holy Spirit. What, then, is the Holy Spirit? And what is Christ? These are the two radical questions discussed in this book. The book is divided into *four parts*, the first giving the Biblical statements on the subject treated; the *second* the explanation of those statements in the light of general Biblical theology; the *third* a speculative discussion of the Person of Christ and the incarnation; and the *fourth* the practical bearings of the truths elicited.

It would be impossible here to give the barest outline of the course of thought pursued in this volume. In fact the arrangement of the material is not as clear and logical as might be desirable in a work of such general merit. This will doubtless detract somewhat from its value; as will also the fact that the style and language, while always intelligible to the patient and painstaking reader, are not so perspicuous always as to make the effort of attention easy and pleasurable. In fact the book is not one of light reading. Indeed, it is not intended merely for reading, but for careful and prolonged study. It must be read again and again, especially by one who comes to it merely with the preparation furnished by the study of the creedal systems of theology—or let us say, rather, the confessional systems, whether Catholic or Protestant, as they have reigned in the theological world generally up to a few decades ago. Such an one will be bewildered at first, rather than enlightened, by the use of old Biblical and theological phrases in a sense which will be to him often new and strange. Perseverance, however, and a determined effort to understand will yield intellectual and spiritual fruit that will amply repay him for his labor.

We shall make no effort, then, to outline our author's course of thought, but content ourselves with a mere reproduction of some of his leading conceptions. And we may as well begin with his conception of the Divine Trinity as with any other. Of course he rejects the doctrine of three divine persons in one divine substance or essence, if the term *person* be taken in its modern psychological sense. There can be no three *egos* or *selves* in God. When the term was first adopted in the ancient creeds it meant, first, *mask*, *appearance*, *manifestation*, then *function*, *office*. This would seem to lead merely to the economic trinity of revelation. But our author contends for an ontological trinity—that is a self-distinction in the divine being. The one absolute divine person goes out of Himself in order to realize Himself, first, in the form of thought, idea, reason, *Logos*, *Son*, and, secondly, in the form of energy, will, love, *Spirit*. God as transcendent and

ever abiding in Himself is the Father; God as immanent in the world is the Son; and God as mediating a *personal* union with and in dwelling in the creature is the Holy Spirit. "God as Son," says our author, "is God as He in His infinite love goes out from the Divine form of life to become the principle of the creation; and this necessarily involves the ultimate realization of Himself in human form—with no double consciousness—standing in filial relation to the Father who is God in His self-preserving transcendency, and, when He completely realizes Himself through the sacrifice of the cross, returning into the fulness of the Divine life in the Father," p. 268. This idea may perhaps be made somewhat clearer by quoting another sentence on the much-debated question concerning the divine *kenosis* in the process of the incarnation. The true *kenosis* "is the eternal passing out of God as Son from the form of the Divine life into the forms of the creation and His continuous impartation of Himself thereto, till at length He enters the world in the Divine-human personality of Christ, and as the result of an ethical process through which humanity has been made susceptible of receiving and expressing the Divine in this full personal form," p. 269.

Perhaps we may be able to give our readers a better idea of our author's theology by quoting his own summary of his discussion of the nature and mode of the incarnation. "Everything," he says, "proceeds from the Divine Reason and Love, which contains within itself both Fatherhood and Sonship. Creation is the Divine Fatherhood going forth to realize the Divine Sonship in finite forms in the world. The Divine Reason, which must first condition itself in the forms and forces of physical nature, in due time—when the necessary conditions exist—manifests itself as Life and works on as Life under the necessary laws of Life. When the development of an organism allows it, it appears as Reason in man, gradually working itself more fully into his life, shining in him as Love also, and seeking as Love to find personal entrance into him. This is the Holy Spirit in the ethical sense seeking to raise man to a higher spiritual and eternal life. And just as the Reason in Nature wrought itself into animal life till rational man appeared—the first Adam; so, for the appearance of the second Adam—man wholly after the Spirit—the Holy Spirit was working itself into human life. At length the goal is reached, and man wholly after the Spirit is born into the world. God as Son can be fully incarnated in man; God through the Holy Spirit can enter and be personally expressed in human form. The Divine Reason and Love have in Him, through the influence of the Holy Spirit, realized themselves; the Divine wholly possesses the human and the human the Divine (I am in the Father and the Father in me), and the man knows himself as the Son of God," p. 319. However abstract and difficult all this may appear to be, it can readily be observed that we have here a method of Christological thought quite different from the old formula of "one per-

son in two natures," as well as from the modern conception of "Christ as a mere man."

In the last part of the work before us the author discusses the practical implications of the new Christology and Pneumatology which he has presented. And, first, he believes that it is the only view which gives us *an ever living and ever present Christ*. There has been much said in modern times about "a return to Christ," or "a rediscovery of Christ." This is well. The Church must ever go back to Christ. Our author, however, thinks that there is nothing in the charge sometimes heard about Paul "hiding the Christ." If the Christ has been lost in impossible metaphysics, it was because Paul was not understood. But a true return to Christ must be a going back to the *spiritual* Christ as well as to the *historical* Christ. And this sense of the spiritual Christ ever present in the Church as the "wisdom of God and the power of God" has not been preserved by the traditional Christologies. The "real presence" of Christ has been regarded as the result merely of sacerdotal magic. The idea of a real Christ present in the Spirit is not easily reconcilable with the ideas of *sacerdotalism* and *sacramentarianism*. The *fatherhood* of God, upon which so much stress is laid at the present time, also, it is believed, receives its true explanation in the light of the Christology here recommended. Again the idea of a real presence of Christ in the Spirit serves as a *moral dynamic* superior to any other ethical force in the world. The love of truth, the social quality of Christianity, and the unity of the Church, will also be promoted by a true Christology. And the errors of theological thought and the deficiencies of religious life, about which there is so much complaint at the present time, will yield before the light of a true and spiritual conception of the Christ. These are propositions which probably few will care to dispute. Have not the same results been looked for from a *Christocentric* theology? It is true, *Christocentric* theologies have been ridiculed. And some of these pretentious systems doubtless deserved the ridicule. Perhaps the system presented in these pages is still crude and imperfect. We have already referred to some imperfections of the book. On a subject like this we see only as in a glass, darkly. But we may expect to see more clearly as the ages go on. And we are convinced that the work here under notice will help to promote clearness of vision. We accordingly commend the work to our readers, warning them however that the perusal of it will not be child's play. It does not "read like a novel"; and yet any intelligent minister will be able to understand it.

